

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1887.

I.

A MEMORIAL SERVICE.

ADDRESSES DELIVERED BEFORE THE SYNOD OF THE REFORMED CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES, IN THE CHURCH OF THE STRANGERS, WEST
PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER 14, 1886, IN MEMORY OF REV. J. WILLIAM-
SON NEVIN, D.D., LL.D.

It has been thought proper to insert the following addresses in this REVIEW, because Dr. Nevin was its first editor. The REVIEW was called into existence in the early days of the history of our institutions at Mercersburg. The founding of the first college and seminary was an event of great significance for the Reformed Church. It naturally called forth a great deal of interest throughout the church. These institutions were to become both the centre and exponent of her life and spirit. It soon began to appear that the church had a life as well as a history of its own which could not be a mere copy of any other church. It was necessary not only to develop a theology that should fitly represent the historical life and faith of the church in whose interest especially these institutions were founded, but also a system of thought or philosophy that would mould the thinking of the college. The time was propitious for calling

forth ability and vigor in both these departments. The revival in theology and philosophy in Germany was just beginning to make itself felt in England, and to some little extent also in this country. The Tractarian movement in the Church of England was exciting attention in Europe, and some echoes were wafted across the Atlantic to our shores. Dr. Rauch and Dr. Schaff were fresh from the renowned universities of Germany, and just commencing their literary career in this land of their adoption. Dr. Nevin, somewhat maturer in years, was eminently qualified by his eminent talents and ripe scholarship to join with them in laying the foundations broad and deep for the new institutions in the Anglo-German life and spirit which came to characterize them. The Alumni of the college felt that the institutions needed an organ through which they could give utterance to their system of thought and co-operate with other institutions and churches in moulding the scholarship and theology of this country. The REVIEW was started with the expectation and promise, on certain conditions, that Dr. Nevin would take charge of its editorship; but as these conditions on the part of the Alumni were not entirely fulfilled, he declined to assume the responsibility of filling this position, but he nevertheless virtually did so by becoming its chief contributor. His editorship lacked only the formal title. The first volume, for the year 1849, contains sixteen articles from his pen, besides a number of valuable book notices which he furnished. From that time on Dr. Nevin contributed numerous articles, scholarly and profound, and on subjects that were of fresh, living interest. The Apostles' Creed was treated in three consecutive articles; the Person of Christ, the Incarnation, True and False Protestantism, the History of Philosophy, the Sect System were among the subjects treated in the first volume. In succeeding years he continued to contribute stirring articles that were read and studied and criticised with more than ordinary interest. It may be justly said, we think, that no other mind stamped itself upon the REVIEW in all the years of its earlier history with so much effect as his.

Therefore it is fitting that the pages of the *REVIEW* should contain the record of this Memorial. It gathers meaning and force from the circumstances under which it was observed. The Memorial service was held in one of the sessions of the old Eastern Synod of the church, in which he held his membership. His voice had often been heard and his presence honored in his attendance upon its annual meetings. As one of the oldest ministers of the church, and one who had held high and honored positions as president of the college and professor in the seminary, it was felt that his departure from earth merited more than a mere passing notice. The Synod joined in a special service to his memory, and the addresses following were delivered on that occasion.

Of course there were other reasons why the editors of the *REVIEW* desired these addresses for publication. The life and labors of such a man are a perpetual benediction to the church in which he lived and labored. "Though dead, he yet speaketh." It is expected that a memorial, in the form, perhaps, of a volume, will be prepared under the direction of the Alumni Association of the college. Steps were taken at their last annual meeting towards this by the appointment of a committee to whom the subject was referred. The notices, addresses and articles thus far prepared have been called forth by the deep feeling and profound sorrow produced throughout the church by his death, and these may all be regarded as preliminary to a more extended and full account of his life in the future. It is only after the first shock produced by his death has passed away, and the full meaning of his life comes up in calm, peaceful retrospection, that such a treatment of the subject can be produced. We have no suggestions to offer to the committee of the Alumni in preparing a fitting memorial of Dr. Nevin, but it may be that the addresses delivered at his funeral by Dr. Apple and Dr. Hodge (so soon gone to join his friend and his father's friend in the other world), as well as the addresses herewith published, will have some interest to the committee in preparing such memorial.

A wish was also expressed at the meeting of Synod for the publication of these addresses, and we are glad that this REVIEW is now honored by placing them upon its pages. These editorial remarks have been called forth by the feeling that the addresses here given possess exceptional interest, and we are assured that no more fitting place could be found for their publication than the Quarterly so often enriched by articles from the pen of the great and good man whose memory receives this humble tribute.—*Eds. of REVIEW.*

ADDRESS BY REV. HENRY MOSSER, OF READING, PA.

In some congregations it is a beautiful custom to remember a deceased pastor by inscribing his name on a tablet and placing the same on the wall of the church. They cheerfully remember devotion to duty, godly walk and conversation. They gratefully embalm his memory by a prominent inscription.

This Synod to-day inscribes on her minutes a grateful recognition of the devout life and self-sacrificing service of Rev. John Williamson Nevin, D.D., LL.D. He was conspicuous in scholarship, a leader among men and a prince in Israel.

Engaging in such service, we desire in no respect to glorify human nature. He is pre-eminently worthy of eulogy. Laudation, whilst in life, was to him most distasteful. It is only in accordance with good taste that, upon this occasion, not a word or thought be uttered in violation of that noble sentiment. No one was more ready to say, with Paul, "By the grace of God I am what I am."

According to the teaching of our holy religion, every life is a gift of God. Each soul being offered eternal salvation, is blessed with the power of choice to accept or reject. We especially rejoice in those who, in the environments of the kingdom, break every fetter of sin, live the life of faith and patiently wait for triumph in glory. In the church many souls shine by grace as the stars, more and more unto the perfect day. Dr. Nevin's life, sanctified by grace, has been to us an inestimable gift.

Since he attained conquest we are sorrowful at the separation, but grateful for his Christian life and service. This Christian gratitude will never cease. The greater our attainments in spiritual life, the better will we be prepared to appreciate this rare gift. We do not hesitate, but promptly, freely, with one heart and voice, glorify grace beautifully revealed in him. The life-work performed, sufferings endured and triumph attained by this distinguished person should now stimulate our faith and fire our energy. Paul plead with the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11 : 1), "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ."

Your speaker, looking up from the sphere of a pastor to the great eminence in thought and work attained by this devout servant, long since learned to regard him as a genius. Like as a sponge takes up moisture, wherever it comes in contact, so the mind of Dr. Nevin freely absorbed knowledge. As a diver carries with him to the bottom of the sea a wire which illumines dark caverns, so his mind penetrated difficult subjects and light shone through them. He did not move in the ruts of other workers; but mastered every subject, formed original combinations, and when propriety suggested, freely gave expression to his convictions. He was brilliant on many subjects; language history, philosophy and theology in every branch are spheres in which he displayed the master mind. The diamond scientifically cut possesses many sides; but the light reflected even from one side gives many colors. Students coming to him with questions of interest or curiosity would soon hear an answer flowing in an astonishing current of erudition.

An aged father gave an account of a visit, shortly before his death. He found the doctor in great feebleness seated on his bed. One of the modern questions of the Bible being referred to, as by the turn of a spigot, he poured out a stream of information.

Contemplating the life and works of this departed father, we are impressed with his aversion to novelties in the church. Customs formulated by the ages cannot be easily set aside. He regarded church history a life-current. He enjoyed security on the bosom of this divine power in the world. Though in the

church militant, not for any consideration, would he mistake a side-current, an eddy of human excitement, for the throbbing stream of grace.

We refer to the religious excitement which swept over the country in 1840-45. In that period many churches failed in devout religious life. Discipline was despised. Morals were neglected. Attempts leading to benevolence were accused of misleading the people. Such a condition called loudly for improvement. Special efforts were deemed a necessity. With such efforts were joined great excitements. The multitude mistook the raptures of the flesh for the work of the Holy Spirit. Under this misconception the wildest extravagance in word and act was practiced. Good under this system did abound, but mischief did much more abound. Dr. Nevin, however, comprehended the situation. He feared nothing from much preaching, nor from many meetings held for prayer. He knew that the Holy Spirit moved people to words and deeds characterized by common sense, order and decency. Divine intelligence, influencing intelligent creatures, could not do otherwise. The little book called "Anxious Bench" was timely. It stemmed the flood. It proved a powerful antidote to fanaticism. The sentiments were everywhere quoted and discussed. Though a class of thinkers used it to substantiate, contrary to his wish, their cold formality, its influence for good extended far beyond the borders of our denomination.

Sincere desire to give the reason for the hope within, led him zealously to study the word of God and the history of the early church. No doubt the peculiar awakening of the church in 1840-45 gave a definite bearing to his subsequent investigations and conclusions.

His contributions to the development of the Christo-centric theory of theology display great originality and research. At first it was not known by that name. For a long time disputed and rejected; it is now, however, accepted by a host of thinkers as a beautiful and powerful statement of Bible truth—a fundamental theological principle. This tenet did not remain in the

sphere of our church. By it we are reminded of the man who came to the west bank of the "Father of waters," the current of which was greatly swollen by recent rains. The mighty flood filled him with awe. He asked the question, "Will not this surging current swell beyond its ordinary bounds?" Just then, to the northwest, on the distant horizon he saw silvery reflections of light. He soon discovered the ordinary channel could not contain so vast a body crowding hurriedly to the gulf. The bank having been broken, the man saw the beginning of that which soon filled a vast area of country. The Christo-centric theory has already broken through denominational channels. It has modified the views of many thinkers and furnished the solution of not a few difficulties. Only a few weeks ago one of the most widely-read religious weeklies of New York City, in a two-column editorial, pointed to this dogma as fundamental in religious thought.

It is probable that his reputation for profundity, the ability to discuss and defend the tap-root principles of theological science, will rest on the "Mystical Presence." He claimed for the work nothing new. He regarded it as a development of Calvin's views of the Lord's Supper. It has found the proud position of authority in religious literature.

The voluminous writers, Drs. Dorner and Ebrard, in their works, unsurpassed by any in the world in their evidence of broad culture and mental acumen, quoted freely from this work.

Several years ago a son of Dr. N., rector of a church in Rome, called on Dr. Samuel Wilberforce, bishop of Oxford, England. Having introduced himself, the bishop was delighted to present his family to "a son of the author of the *Mystical Presence*." Immediately the bishop reached for the book, in a prominent place of the library, and dwelt enthusiastically upon the benefits derived from its perusal.

Time fails us to speak of his decision in accepting the Professorship of Theology in the seminary located at Mercersburg. This involved much for him and for us. His services constituted an important epoch in the history of our institutions.

Time fails us to speak of his relation to the church universal. His culture was of such breadth that he could not be restricted within the narrow limits of a denomination. He acknowledged truth, activity and fruits of a Christian life in all ages and in all relations of life. He anticipated the church's intense longing for greater unity. He regarded unity as a function of her eternal constitution. Instead of dreaming of new systems, he searched vigorously the word of God, church history and the science of theology.

We have infinite pleasure in thinking of the noble consecration of his genius to the glory of God—a consecration characterized by singleness of purpose and unquestioned humility. The world loves to applaud and honor the heroes of many battles. The greater the slaughter in attaining the hero's purpose the greater his glory. In the sphere of grace every one who wins the crown is infinitely greater than the military hero. The "golden calf of self-love," being carved into never so curious form, is a deity, who suggests a worship of enervation, degradation and final condemnation. Dr. N.'s life, uniting with invisible Goodness, found the celestial fountain of true enjoyment and hope. His genius "willed one thing, to which all other things were made subservient." "The wedge will rend rocks, but its edge must be sharp and single; if it be double, the wedge is bruised in pieces and will rend nothing."

Having attained the unusual age of eighty-four years, he responded calmly to the dread summons. The life of faith had an appropriate ending. The sun, having filled the earth with life and gladness, closes the day in saffron, sapphire and glory. As he lived, so he died. His well-grounded hope was the comfort of those who bore the remains to the silent tomb.

"The grave can naught destroy,
Only the flesh can die;
And e'en the body triumphs o'er decay.
Clothed by Thy wondrous might,
In robes of dazzling light,
This flesh shall burst the grave at that last day."

JOHN WILLIAMSON NEVIN: HIS GODLINESS.

BY PROF. E. V. GERHART, D.D.

Of the Rev. John Williamson Nevin, D.D., LL.D., much has deservedly on different occasions been spoken, respecting his high order of mental endowments, his classical and theological scholarship, his ability in the realm of philosophy, his progressive spirit in theological science as exhibited by the assertion and development of the Christological principle, and his educational influence upon the ministry and membership of the Reformed Church; not to speak of wider circles of church life in which the impulse given by him to organic methods of thought has been felt and acknowledged. A new testimonial to his worth and the significance of his labors among us has just been furnished, to which we have all been listening with saddened, grateful hearts.

Not so much has been said of the personal Christian traits of Dr. Nevin's character. The time assigned me in this memorial service I propose, therefore, to occupy by contemplating the rich legacy which his eminent spirituality, in a service of more than forty years, has bequeathed to the Reformed Church of our time.

Strong as was the intellect of Dr. Nevin, remarkable as were his gifts in the sphere of philosophy, and distinguished as he was for free theological inquiry, yet neither the theological nor the philosophical was the fundamental characteristic of the man.

It was my lot to be closely associated with our deceased brother for more than thirty years; for one year as student; subsequently we were neighbors and friends, fellow-teachers, members of the same college Faculty; also members of laborious committees, when it was necessary to work

together, day after day, for weeks in succession; and connected in other capacities which I need not particularize. On the basis of the knowledge gained from these varied personal relations, I years ago was led to form the opinion that the deepest and the controlling principle of his history and character was not strength and compass of thought, not love of original speculation, but *personal religion*; and of this the prominent feature was not so much concern for his individual salvation as reverence for God and consecration to His service.

1. For him God was first—first in his consciousness, first as the law for his will, and for his pursuits. God's existence, His presence, His authority, His holiness, His honor were for him living and constant realities. It appeared to me that the sense of God's presence and of his personal responsibility to God were never absent from his mind. I do not remember that I ever saw him so wholly absorbed in any question, philosophical or theological, social, secular or political, whatever the occasion may have been, or so wholly occupied with controversial issues, that this sense of his personal relationship to God was for the time entirely in suspense. He did not forget himself; and then, as it were, wake up to find that his soul had broken away from its anchorage in God. Of course, his heart and mind were not always with equal measure imbued with the unction of a spiritual habit. Like other believers, his Christian life had at one time more freshness and vigor than at another. But he was distinguished rather for an equable than a changeful experience. His seasons of depression did not arise from a loss of the consciousness of God or of God's presence, nor from any wavering as to the divine purpose of his life; but from the great difficulty which, at certain epochs in his history, he experienced in the endeavor to solve some doctrinal and ecclesiastical problems, and from his conscientious dread of a decision contrary to divine truth.

I have been laying stress on *God* in his religious character, not on Jesus Christ; and I have done this designedly. For it was the *divine* in religion which Dr. Nevin especially empha-

sized. I do not forget that Jesus, the Word made flesh, the Christ of God, became with him the principle of theology, and of all sound philosophic thought. But Christ was this fundamental principle, not because He was held to be the infallible teacher of infallible truth, nor because He had accomplished the work of redemption; but the Christ was the living centre of all realms of truth because He was the personal God in human flesh. In Jesus of Nazareth Dr. Nevin recognized the organic unity of the spiritual and the natural, of the heavenly and the earthly, of the true God and true man in one person. He insisted on the veritable humanity of our Lord, on a union of the human nature with the divine nature that was indissoluble. But the significance and value of the incarnation lay in the mystery that the Son of Man was God. Fellowship with Jesus, the Son of Mary, the second Man, was not merely the way of access to God, but fellowship with Jesus was fellowship with God *Himself*. The words of Jesus uttered God's voice.

2. Dr. Nevin was a man of deep and varied spiritual experiences. His religious sensibilities were lively and keen. At times the simple reading of God's word at the family altar or in the public sanctuary, would so profoundly move his mind and heart that he could with difficulty proceed with the service. Now and then it was necessary momentarily to pause in order to gain the mastery over his emotions. Yet, of his religious emotions he never spoke. His feelings were never the subject of his conversation, much less of any part of a public discourse, though at the very time he might be speaking with intense emotion. Nor did he seem to put any value on feelings. He was ever looking away from himself to God, to God manifest in the Christ, concerned only that he might know God, receive His life, drink in His Spirit, and by fellowship with Christ ever become more and more Godlike.

From this personal attitude toward God manifest in the flesh came his lively spiritual sympathies. It was this constant divine fellowship that was ever kindling his emotional life.

Hence some men who rarely or never came into personal association with Dr. Nevin could not understand him. He ever wrote, and spoke, and preached on God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, and on the objective facts of Christianity, ever urging men to behold and consider positive spiritual truth, and lay rightly to heart the infinite worth and almighty saving strength of Jesus Christ; but he rarely proceeded to exhort a congregation to cultivate their emotional life or any class of spiritual feelings. He even went much further. Those who made it an object to excite the emotional nature, and deemed it a part of their work to devise new methods for this purpose, he would denounce. His denunciations were even severe. But they were severe just because he had such profound and varied experiences concerning the absolute truth and the supreme value, not of man, but of *God*, in religion—of God, the only, the ever-flowing fountain of all heavenly good. With him religious feeling was spontaneous. It was worth nothing at all, it was even delusive, except as it was a part of the fellowship in the Holy Ghost with God by living faith in Jesus Christ.

His religion was profoundly emotional, but the emotional principle was not the spring of his religious life.

3. Dr. Nevin was noted for his conscientiousness. This trait in his spiritual character was the natural consequence of the emphasis which he spontaneously and constantly put on the *divine* in religion. The law of God revealed by the personal Word was for him the supreme and the only authority. As the needle turns to the pole, so his conscience turned towards the right. And he drew a broad line between the right and the expedient, the convenient, the useful, or the politic and prudent. He was as innocent of shrewdness as he was of cunning; so considerate was he of the right that he rarely entertained prudential considerations. When he betrayed hesitation or indecision as to a practical question, it was not because he was weighing personal interests, but because it was not at once definitely evident to his mind what were the demands of truth and righteousness.

Yet, Dr. Nevin never spoke of his conscience, nor professed

to be conscientious. His words on moral questions, whether in the class-room, on the floor of our church courts or in the social circle, were objective. Not unless an attempt was made to influence his conduct contrary to his judgment of right, did he make direct reference to his personal sense of obligation. His strict conscientiousness was seen in the whole course of his life. It shone forth at every step, in his words, in his deeds, in his attitude and bearing on all occasions. Some of his best friends, no less than his opponents, often differed with him widely in opinion or judgment; but no one who knew the simplicity and Godly sincerity of the man, ever failed to confide in his uprightness and his all-controlling regard for moral truth.

For nearly a half-century he lived among us. At different times he filled successively all the positions of trust which were at the disposal of the Reformed Church. How numerous and perplexing the duties which were imposed upon him, in teaching, in college discipline, in literary labors, in fighting theological battles, in breaking a pathway upward, through ignorance, doubts, fears and errors, toward a higher level of Christian truth, often amid clouds and darkness, often with one hand pressing forward and with the other overthrowing his foes,—yet, do I not utter the heart-felt convictions of this assembly of ministers, elders and people when I say that he held the confidence of the church and the world in his supreme love for truth and righteousness with unshaken firmness to the end? Such a testimony to the living authority of God, to the absolute claims of Christianity, to the power of divine right and of the human conscience is a legacy of inestimable moral worth. Such a long life of unwavering integrity and personal uprightness is a spiritual benediction.

4. The personal religion and the positive moral character of our revered teacher and spiritual father was constantly nourished by the use of all the means of grace. Of his attendance upon public worship, his reverential observance of the sacraments and his habits of prayer I shall not speak. Instead, I shall dwell on his appreciation and constant use of the Word

of God. The Bible, including all the canonical books of the Old Testament and the New Testament, was for him a means of grace of unspeakable spiritual worth. The written word was for his heart the Word of God. In it divine life pulsed. Human words were instinct with heavenly realities. The Bible he studied historically, geographically, exegetically and theologically. At different periods of his history all these phases and relations of Scripture were patiently and thoroughly examined. But these interests, however solemn and important he believed them to be, were not with him matters of greatest moment. He read and studied the Word of God principally for his personal spiritual edification.

I believe that this kind of Scripture study was characteristic of his whole Christian career, beginning with his youth, and extending through the long years of professional activity onward to old age. Dr. Nevin was a constant *devotional* student of the Bible. He prized it solely on account of its manifold inexhaustible wealth of divine truth. He studied it in Hebrew and Greek, in English, Latin and German. He read, and read, the Word in the original tongues, perhaps as frequently as in his native English, and often with greater preference.

This decided predilection for Bible study distinguished him when he was a student at Princeton. There was no abatement during his professional and public career; but it grew with his advancing years; and it was most remarkable in his old age. During the last several years of his life, it might be said of him with literal correctness: his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in His law doth he meditate day and night.

It may not be generally known that for the last year or two of his life Dr. Nevin was afflicted with the loss of vision. He could no longer himself read the written Word. He felt this deprivation deeply. Though large portions of the Word were accurately treasured up in his memory, yet these treasures were no adequate compensation for the loss. But when the eye failed he substituted the ear. Members of his family read to him, and the principal book which he requested them to read,

and often for days or weeks the only book, was the written Word of God. I add the singular fact that for the last year, perhaps for a much longer time, he neither preferred the Word in the original tongues nor in his native English ; but more than either he enjoyed the Latin version. The Word of God through the medium of the Latin language, as I heard him say, brought the divine truth with singular freshness and unction to his mind and heart.

Did time permit, these reflections on the religious life and spiritual experiences of a great and good man might be extended with interest and profit. But I shall not transgress assigned limits. So rich a theme can scarcely be handled without running into undue length. I shall therefore close with one concluding remark.

The secret of Dr. Nevin's notable history was his *godliness*. Great as he was in the different spheres of thought, he was still greater in the sphere of positive Christian faith. He has rendered manifold valuable services to the church into which he was transplanted, and his influence in the line of Christological Theology will tell upon generations yet unborn ; but our chief cause for gratitude to God is this :—that in the course of His Providence He led into the fold of the Reformed Church a man of genuine spirituality, of godly simplicity, of moral heroism and of thoroughly upright character—a man along the pathway of whose life bloomed on either side the fragrant flowers of genuine goodness.

II.

THE ETHICAL CONSTITUTION OF THE SOCIAL ECONOMY.

BY PROF. THOS. G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

THROUGHOUT the whole order of the world, from the most rudimentary forms of existence up to its crowning summit in man, two forces are operative. In inorganic matter they are repulsion and attraction, the one causing the particles to stand out of each other, the other holding them bound to each other and to a common centre. In organic existence these forces are raised into a higher sphere and constitute the relation that subsists between the organic centre, the principle of life and the organs which express the power of individuation, the relation between the whole and the parts. This process of development is sometimes characterized as the reciprocal relation of form and contents, the law being that the progress of organization is determined by the degree in which the former asserts its control over the latter. Matter which has at first a minimum of form, and may be called *formless*, becomes, in the process of development, so permeated by the form as to be radiant at every point with the glory of its pervading life.

Another way of expressing this same law of development is to say that nature, throughout all its processes, seeks for individuation. And this is the law expressed by the evolutionists, and sometimes held up to derision by their opponents, viz.: that all created existence starts first in homogeneity, then differentiates itself in heterogeneity, in order to reach a higher unity, which is simply saying that all life tends to express its manifoldness and fruitfulness in variety, through which unity and harmony nevertheless prevail.

A great deal has been gained in recent years by studying humanity in the light of those laws and processes in nature below man, through which the archetype of the world wrought with plastic force to actualize itself in him as the last result. In studying nature with this object in view, we are in a certain sense studying the genesis of man as he emerges from her womb into the light of a higher spiritual world of existence.

Looking now at human existence, we find the same general law referred to in the constitution of the social economy. Humanity is an organic unity which unfolds itself through subordinate organisms, such as race, nation, family, and reaching its final individuation in individuals, or single personalities. The right study of this economy must begin with the study of these two factors in their antithetic and reciprocal relation, the general life and the individual life; and the progress of civilization must be determined by the degree in which these two factors advance in right relation to each other. The social economy of the world crystallizes, or rather organizes, itself by the mutual operation of these two laws, and its progress is graduated by the degree in which these two factors advance in actualizing the full meaning of all that is originally contained in the idea of humanity. The first and the most universal and fundamental differentiation of the generic life of man, as the genus *homo*, consists in the evolution of the two sexes, one of the purposes of which evidently is the propagation of the race, but the ethical purpose of which is the complementing of one life by that of another, where, from the antithesis of spiritual life, there results, through the communion of love, the advancement of each to a more complete actualization of being. The first man, as the generic head of the race, included in himself, potentially, the whole of humanity, and his life became divided first when woman was formed out of him, as his other self, in order that these two might then complement each other in the reciprocity of love. Upon this is based the primary subordinate organism of the human race—the family. In this organism is at once miniaturized the subsequent organism of the state, and at

the same time of the race, as a whole, with all its complex organization.

The idea of the state has its origin, not in any external social compact, as is sometimes held, by which the individuals of which it is composed surrender each certain natural rights for the good of the whole, but in this innate or inherent mutual relation between these two factors—the generic and the individual life of man. Society organizes itself by natural instinct or necessity into two rudimentary forms or factors—the governing and the governed—the one representing the generic life, the other the individual life of man, and its progress depends on the mutual advancement of these two factors in right relation towards perfection. As this idea of the state unfolds itself it is found to include subordinate organisms, externally and internally, the one expressed by external geographical boundary lines, designating the spacial or territorial alliances that grow out of external association, the other expressed by community of pursuits, by which, without regard to spacial boundaries, men are joined in industrial and professional classes.

Thus we reach, in the social economy, a complex organism in which individual men are embraced, and by which they attain their growth and perfection. The organization of the social economy, then, is divinely ordained in the constitution of humanity, just as really and truly as the individual person is created from the same divine source. Within certain limits man may determine the particular form of this social economy, but in its fundamental constitution it is just as truly determined and ordained of God as the solar system, with its planets revolving around their central sun.

Let us inquire, now, as briefly as we can, the manner in which these two factors, society and the individual, work together by divine ordainment for the advancement of man in the progress of history. On the one hand, the individual stands in a relation of antithesis, by which he develops that measure of personal independence which is necessary to the growth of his individual or personal life. He stands here in a sphere of rela-

tive independence, and becomes, as it were, according to the designation of Hobbes, a fighting animal; or, according to the assertion of our Declaration of Independence, endowed with certain inalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This relation is the result of the law of repulsion, which, in the lower realms of nature, secures the particles, or atoms, a separate and independent existence. They are all gathered up in the one postulate, that every individual is entitled to a proper sphere in which to develop the possibilities of his being, not only without let or hindrance, negatively, but also with all necessary help from society positively. The only limitation that government of any kind, whether in the family or the State, can lawfully set to this freedom of personal progress or development is, to prevent any infringement on the same equal rights of every other person, and injury to itself.

The sacredness of these rights is measured by the nature and significance of man's personality. Where these are imperfectly understood they will naturally be undervalued. It is just upon this point that modern socialism has received into it a new element as compared with ancient civilization. In the most advanced and highly cultured nations of antiquity the rights of personality, as such, were but little appreciated. A man was estimated in his relation to the State only, and not in himself. Plato's "Republic" makes him an instrument to the State. Parents had absolute control over their children, and the weak and sickly among them could be put to death with impunity, just as in some heathen nations now female children are sacrificed, while the male children are spared, as the survival of the fittest. It is really only in the nations of Christendom that the rights of man, as man, have come to be regarded as sacred. This, in our interpretation of history, is traceable to the sacredness of personality which has been brought out in Christianity. It is only there that man's personality is set forth as an end in itself, and not merely an instrument to something beyond itself, because it is endowed with immortality, and this immortal destiny has come to be accepted in modern civilization. And

this has brought with it a reversal of the theory of Plato that the individual is for the State, and made it to read—the State is for the people. However imperfectly actualized, this idea has become inwoven in modern civilization, and it will work towards recognition in practice as well as in theory.

But the social problem has to do not only with the rights of the individual. If we regard humanity as an organism, we must find another law, according to which the individual is attracted to the social order in which his life must find its completion. This law of attraction grows out of his social nature, which is equally a factor in his constitution with his relative independence. Every one is born in the bosom of a life that is broader and deeper than his individuality, and this more general life is a necessary condition for the right development of his personal life. It is in this social relation that he is drawn out of his narrow egoity, and realizes that unselfish enlargement of his being which is necessary to the development of true manhood. If we consider the true nature of marriage, we shall find that its deepest moral and spiritual significance lies in that interchange or communion of being by which the selfish principle is broken in upon and the unselfish principle has scope for its exercise. The same principle operates in the unselfish devotion of parent to child. When the individual thus begins to live for another there is a new enlargement of his being resulting from the exercise of unselfish affections. The family widens into the State, where we find a broader sphere of humanity. The family itself is apprehended by this more general life, and the individual now feels himself in a sphere where his personal growth takes a wider form of development. Here room is made for love of country—patriotism—which is still farther removed from the egoism of his individual life. Some of the most heroic instances of an unselfish life have resulted from the power of this principle.

The State, however, is only an integral function in a still broader organism—the race. Man's social nature cannot complete itself until it feels the throbbings of that humanity

which comprehends the whole brotherhood of man, in the bosom of which the highest of all inspirations in his social nature become realized in philanthropy. In this sphere we have such universal interests as science and art, which know no national limitations, but bring all men into one common brotherhood.

Our object in sketching thus briefly the divine order of the world's life is to show the internal necessity which it possesses for the right development of human life. The social order is by no means an external, factitious arrangement projected by man's wisdom or choice, but it is the evolution of possibilities implanted in it in its creation, and therefore bears upon it the *imprimatur* of its great Creator; to show, moreover, that these normal general orders of life, clothed as they are with divine authority, are not merely for the purpose of exercising the authority of law, in order to preserve good order in society, or merely to protect individual rights, but they are a necessity for individual growth by the inflow of life into the individual. As the branch receives into itself the life of the tree, so the individual receives into himself the life of those forms of humanity that ministers to his growth and completion.

From this it is at once apparent that while within certain limits these normal forms of social life may be determined and regulated by the will of the people, in their essential constitution they are of divine appointment, and clothed with divine authority. Respect and reverence for this authority come through the religious nature of man. Even heathen nations cannot live without the gods. Take away this support and the social fabric falls into anarchy and ruin. The theory that the ultimate authority of government rests on the will of the people could not preserve organized society from lapsing into barbarism.

As Christianity has brought to light the sacredness of personality, so also it holds forth the true ideal of the social order. It sets forth the true basis for the institution of the family by restoring the relation of marriage to its original character, over against the mutilated forms into which it had fallen in heathenism. It rested the parental authority on an authority back of

it, in God, giving the parent, not absolute, but delegated, control over the child. It asserted the divine authority of the State, while, at the same time, it distinguished here also between the ultimate and the relative authority.

Thus far our statements of the nature and design of the social order in the constitution of the world's life will, no doubt, be generally accepted. They are so plain as to be common-places. But when we consider how far society has actualized its true idea, and what are the prospects of its doing so in the future, we have a different question to deal with. The ideal, it must be said, is right and fair; the actualization of it presents a sad spectacle indeed.

The evolutionist will have it that the failure is only apparent—the imperfections and evils that have marked the course of history are only the conditions necessary to attain the desired goal. As the child must suffer for many a blunder, and fall before it learns to know and obey the laws of its physical constitution, yet comes finally to walk with ease, so the social life of the race must learn by trial and experience to know and obey the laws of its higher ethical life. No one, certainly, can doubt the advancement of the world in the elements of its social life, if by this we mean the evolution of the potentialities and resources of humanity. There has been vast progress in the study of the social problem. Never before in the history of the world have the social relationships of the world been so extended and so intensely developed. The progress in discovery, invention, in science and the useful arts have drawn together the ends of the whole earth. The laws of industry, of commerce, of manufacture have been developed, until we are coming to realize a society of man that encircles the globe and forms a net-work as broad as the race.

But whether the sum of human happiness has advanced with advancing civilization is a question that may receive different answers. The optimist, looking at the nobler and better aspects of human society, believes that the progress has been of such a character as to assure the complete solution of the great

problem of human destiny. The pessimist, having before him the suffering and sorrow resulting from the willful perversion of the best institutions and the best social relations, pronounces life in the individual and the race a failure, regards conscious existence an evil, and sees no solution except in the return of the creation into the nirvana of the Buddhist.

One of the saddest revelations of our modern civilization is to be found just in this philosophy of despair that has come like a dark pall over the minds of so many in the most cultivated nations of the earth. The fact that society finds no relief for the despair of the individual in the increasing number of suicides in the very heart of civilization and culture and refinement might, perhaps, be explained by the fact that there may be healthful progress in the body of society, while weakness lingers as the lot of many of its members. So the development of an organized opposition to the social organism in a semi-barbarous despotism—like Russia—might be attributed to its very barbarism, its lack of advancement in civilization. But when we find the rumbling of social volcanoes in such nations as Germany, England, France, and America, and when, moreover, we find some of the most advanced philosophers of that country—Germany—which has looked deepest into the problem of man, maintaining with a power and a fascination which attracts to it the belief of the learned and the cultured, that the social problem is wrecked in failure, certainly we cannot wave all this aside as a mad dream or temporary nightmare. A dose of pessimism may not be without its use in correcting a one-sided optimism, which dreams only of a golden age, whose day has already dawned upon the world. The signs of the times, in our judgment, betoken the approach of social convulsions that may be more terrible than those which have already occurred. The study and concern of the most earnest thinkers are not misdirected as they bend their energies to the consideration of the science of sociology, for just there the evil threatens. Time was when mad ambition could administer a temporary palliative to such difficulties by wars of aggression, in which the

slaughter of hundreds of thousands silenced the cries and groans of the suffering and the oppressed. But the danger that now impends is of a different character, and it will not be remedied by any such ruse. The teachings of modern civilization have so universally permeated all ranks and classes that all know their rights, and they demand that the evil shall be remedied, not shirked for a time, leaving their children to groan in the same treadmill of oppression. The rapid accumulation of wealth and power in the hands of the favored few, and the social tyranny which condemns the poor to a life of industrial slavery, where no ray of light betokens a better day to come—this it is that causes the social fabric in Europe and America to tremble and shudder with the apprehension of new moral convulsions.

But all this only serves to reveal the reality of the conflict of which our earth is the theatre. It only proves, over against the evolutionist, that moral evil is not merely an imperfection or a mistake, which the world, in its own strength and power of will, can eliminate when it has once learned to know the wrong to be remedied. It teaches—ought to teach—that the disease is more deeply seated than the ignorance and mistakes of governing classes and powers, and requires a remedy more radical than correct theories of sociology or mere political reformation. We mean not by this that these are not proper and necessary in their place. Much may be done, should and must be done, to right the wrongs in the social economy, to rectify and perfect the political machinery of the State, to regulate the relation between capital and labor, to lift the burdens from the oppressed, to overcome the unjust discriminations against the sex of our mothers, our wives and our sisters; but the ultimate help and hope must come through that slow, yet steady triumph of truth over error—the good over the evil—which advances equally the governing and the governed, the general life of the social economy and the individuals of which it is composed.

According to Guizot the progress of civilization implies the advance of these two factors—on the one hand, the improve-

ment of the general organization of society, and on the other, of the individual. We have tried to show their mutual relation, and how the one is dependent on the other. In this progress, then, we may expect greater perfection of organization. If we consider the factor of government, it is plain that it must lead in opening up ways and means for actualizing the rights of the citizen, for providing the conditions necessary in order that he may secure competency by honest labor, and in every proper way advance his earthly happiness. Among the many social questions that press for solution on this side, perhaps the most urgent just now is the regulation of the relation between capital and labor. It is within the province of the law here to correct certain abuses, to prevent, on the one side, the tyranny of employers over employees, to restrain the greed for gain, to regulate the hours of labor, to protect children from being forced into work before they attain a certain amount of education, to do away with unjust discriminations against female labor, etc.; and, on the other side, to restrain such combinations of the laboring classes as are aimed at the destruction of the rights of property and capital. Wrongs exist on both sides, and the government must protect both alike. Legislation, in all such cases, should be restricted to the necessities of the case. As the wise physician aims to assist nature in effecting a cure, so the wise legislator seeks to protect and stimulate those natural laws which tend to regulate the wants of society. Too much legislation tends to suppress and destroy the freedom and vigor of these natural principles which underlie all laws, just as too much medicine destroys the life of the patient. But the theory is not correct that all such industrial interests must be left entirely to provide for themselves. Too little legislation is just as really an evil as too much.

But no organization, however perfect, can accomplish its purposes without the elevation at the same time of the individuals composing it. The efficacy of good government depends on the co-operation of the citizens. Hence it is of vital importance that such general education shall be provided as

that all may partake of its benefits. We, in this country, rely much on this for the advancement of the public weal. Intellectual training, however, is helpless without moral culture. Hence, whatever tends to inculcate right principles of action and stimulate the formation and growth of right character, must be especially encouraged and fostered. Here is the weakness in our system of public education. If religion cannot be taught in these schools, there may, at least, be taught the established principles of sound morality which true religion inculcates. Respect for authority, reverence for age, honesty, truthfulness, sobriety, economy—these, at least, can be fostered, not only in the family, but in the school, and their value and importance certainly rise immeasurably above mere intellectual attainments. Here the beginning must be made to overcome corruption in the government. The building will be just what the material is of which it is constructed.

But now we come to the last difficulty in the social problem. Is man—is the world—capable of such moral improvement and elevation? Or, is it afflicted with an incurable moral disease? We are not of those who regard human nature as destitute of all good. We have faith in man. But if history has proved anything on this subject, it has shown that help must come from beyond man in order to solve the problem of, we say not his eternal destiny, but of his temporal well-being. The motive-power that is necessary to strengthen the human will, the light that is to reveal the true end of life, even in its worldly sense, must come from beyond man.

It is not our purpose to enter upon an argument to show that the ethical nature of man must receive its inspiration from the religious. This will be admitted by all who grant that the religious is the highest interest in man, that his relation to God will and must determine the character of his relation to his fellow-man. The order here is laid down by the infinite wisdom of the law-giver of the universe. The *first* commandment is fulfilled in love to God, and the second, growing out of this, is love to man.

We reach the conclusion, therefore, that the highest estate in all government is the estate of religion, viewing the subject now from the standpoint of the State. Religion has a work of its own, which looks to the happiness and well-being of man in the state of existence that lies beyond the boundaries of time. With this the State is not directly concerned. The church here is independent of the State, and the injunction holds—render to God the things that are God's. But so far as the advancement of earthly social well-being is concerned, and for the solution of the problems that here meet the State, the protection and support of the estate of religion stands first. The estate of the magistracy may suppress crime by law, but its power is negative. The estate of education may give light, but it cannot produce the warmth of life. Commerce, manufacture, agriculture look to man's physical well-being, but the ultimate power that must regulate the world is the religious principle. The State cannot furnish this, but it can protect and foster it. This does not imply any unrighteous union of Church and State, as in the Middle Ages, when the church transcended its sphere and lost its influence by dabbling in politics, nor, as in some modern governments, where the State undertakes to control instead of protect religion. It leaves the world order in politics, in science and art to develop freely the great capacities of humanity as essential to human progress, and simply postulates that the spiritual power of religion shall be allowed freely to inspire the motives of human action in all spheres of life. There need be no collision here. Christ never interfered with the natural normal organization of society, but He brought into the world the life that is to infuse into them strength for actualizing their own idea. He had no rivalry with Cæsar. All that is asked is that His religion shall not be opposed by the State, and when the State fosters it by guaranteeing its free activity it does most and best to advance its own prosperity and perpetuity. The imperfect form or body of Christianity is the church. This is, therefore, the tangible form in which the State is to protect and foster it. We need not despair if we find that these two—the

Church and Christianity—are not in full harmony, any more than we need to despair of government because its imperfect forms and imperfect administration, in the hands of fallible and imperfect politicians fail to actualize its idea fully. The truth here is that the Church is not a Saviour, but itself constantly in need of being saved; but Christianity is the saving power to infuse life in the social economy, and it is the last hope of the world. If the social problem is not finally solved by its influence, it will not be because of any insufficiency in the life thus provided, but because the world prefers to depend on its own wisdom and strength, and in that degree we may expect to see the fulfillment of the words of one of England's poets, who uttered the pessimism of his own spirit and experience when he said,—

“There is the moral of all human tales;

’Tis but the same rehearsal of the past;

First freedom, and then glory; when that fails—

Wealth, vice, corruption—barbarism at last.”

III.

QUALIFICATIONS NECESSARY FOR A SUCCESSFUL MINISTRY.

BY REV. JOHN M. TITZEL, D.D.

THE importance of the ministerial work it would not be easy to overestimate. It has to do not merely with the interests of time, but still more especially with those of eternity. Its improper performance, accordingly, may result not only in temporal, but in eternal ruin. On this account it should ever be a matter of the highest concern to all who believe in the truths of Christianity, that only such persons are admitted to the ministry, by the proper authorities of the church, as are qualified faithfully to discharge the duties which properly pertain to a steward of the mysteries of God.

But the question may arise,—What qualifications should a minister of the Gospel possess so as to be able to discharge aright the duties of his sacred calling? Some thoughts in the way of answer to this question may not be amiss at this time, when a want of sufficient ministers is in some quarters complained of, and more than ordinary efforts are being made to induce young men to enter the ministry. For, while it is important that there should be a sufficient number of ministers to properly supply the needs of the church, it is still more important that those who are invested with authority to preach the Word of God and administer the sacraments should have the requisite qualifications for their work. The church in the end, there is every reason to believe, will not suffer so much from a paucity of ministers as from an incompetent and improperly equipped ministry. As a rule, those who are seriously mistaught are in a worse condition than those who are simply un-

taught; for error instilled into the minds of men as divinely-inspired truth is ever the most obstinate and dangerous enemy of true righteousness.

Now, as regards the qualifications for the ministry, the one of primary importance is, undoubtedly, true conversion. He that would lead others to Christ must have first found Christ himself, and must be able, like Saint Paul, to say,—“I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day.” No matter what other qualifications a minister may possess, if he has never been regenerated by the grace of God and renewed in the inward man by the Holy Ghost, he will at best be but a blind leader of the blind. And this ought to be kept more constantly in mind than, we fear, it generally is, by those who would enter into the ministry, and, also, by church judicatories. Too often, there is reason to believe, young men seek the ministerial office rather as a means of making a respectable living than because they feel and realize the power and importance of the truth as it is in Jesus, and are anxious to make it known to others that they, too, may enjoy its blessings. And yet, if the motive just indicated does not prompt them to engage in the work of preaching the Gospel, it is not likely that their so doing will accomplish much in the way of building up the kingdom of God among the children of men. For, if any one would impress the truth upon others, it is necessary that he should be deeply impressed with it himself. Only when a person is thoroughly persuaded in his own mind of the importance of what he teaches, has he true power to persuade and convince others that it is wise and expedient to follow his instructions. The very fact that he himself thoroughly believes what he declares is, in itself, always a strong testimony to those who listen to him that what he affirms is true. Nor are men generally slow in discovering whether a man is speaking from actual conviction, or only retailing what he has learned or gathered from others. There is an eloquence of conviction which it is impossible for any one, for any length of time, to successfully imitate. For a little

while a master in the art of deception may impose on his fellow-men, but sooner or later it will always be discovered that he is only making believe that he is in earnest. No matter, therefore, how important or profound the truths may be, which a minister proclaims to those who wait on his ministry, they will make but little impression on the minds and hearts of those to whom he ministers, if he has not experienced their power himself. And just here, we think, is to be found one great reason why so little is often accomplished by the preaching of the Gospel. There is failure, not because the truth is not proclaimed or clearly set forth, or because the hearts of the hearers have become impervious to the influences of divine grace; but because the truths uttered come not really from the heart of the preacher himself. It is folly, therefore, for an unconverted man to enter the ministry, or for the church to admit to this sacred calling any excepting such as she has good reason to believe are truly renewed in heart and life.

But, important as true conversion is, this, in itself, is not the only thing requisite for a successful ministry. A man may be a very good Christian, and yet a very poor preacher and pastor. Other qualifications, both natural and acquired, besides that of sincere piety, are necessary in order to true success in winning souls to Christ. And this, too, it is important for the Church and for those who are thinking of entering the ministry to keep in mind.

Among the natural qualifications which a minister of the Gospel should possess the following may be designated as especially important, and any one deficient in any of them should consider the matter well before he concludes that he has a true call to become an ambassador for Christ, and to take upon himself the pastoral office:

First, he should have a sound physical constitution. Sometimes it is thought that when persons are physically too weak to engage successfully in secular occupations that they are, nevertheless, fitted for the work of the ministry. But this is a serious mistake, as many have learned by sad experience. To

be truly successful in his work a minister requires a healthy and vigorous body. He needs this in order that he may be able to endure the physical strain to which he is unavoidably subjected in the proper discharge of his ministerial and pastoral duties; and he needs it, also, that his thoughts and feelings may be healthy and vigorous, and consequently awaken healthy and vigorous thoughts and feelings in the minds and hearts of those among whom he labors. The mind and body are so related that the one cannot but affect the other. A diseased body invariably tends to enfeeble the mind. When a man is in ill-health he cannot think and study as he can when perfectly well. That the mind may be clear and strong it is generally, if not always, necessary that the body should be in a healthy and sound condition. Much of the bad theology with which the world is afflicted, there is reason to believe, is due to the disordered and dyspeptic condition of the physical system of those who teach it.

Secondly, a minister, to be truly successful in his work, must be possessed of superior mental, moral and spiritual endowments. It is sometimes supposed that all men are by nature the same as regards their capacities and powers, and that the differences which manifest themselves in them are the result merely of a difference of intellectual and spiritual culture. It is also sometimes claimed that in spiritual things natural endowments are of but little account. But facts, we think, clearly prove the contrary. They very plainly show that what men are capable of becoming depends, in a great measure, on their in-born susceptibilities. Not any man, by any concurrence of circumstances or by any amount of training, could be made an Elijah, or a John the Baptist, or an Apostle Paul. The Holy Spirit was only able to work so mightily through these champions of the truth because of the high order of their natural endowments. And so it is still. The grace of God never works magically upon or through men, but always in harmony with the true constitution of their being. Only such persons, accordingly, as are possessed of more than merely ordinary in-

tellectual acumen, moral depth of character, and spiritual insight, can reasonably be expected, as ministers of the gospel, to be notably successful in winning souls to Christ and extending His kingdom among men. And the reason of this we need not go far to discover. Ministers necessarily are brought into contact with all classes of men. They have to do not merely with the stupid and superficial, but also with those of sound sense and deep insight. Now, they should be able to supply the spiritual needs of all these classes of persons. But how can they do this unless their own endowments are, at least, equal to those of the most gifted persons under their pastoral care? In the very nature of the case, an intellectually dull man will not be able to satisfy the wants of one intellectually bright, nor will a person of obtuse moral and spiritual perceptions be able to enlighten or impress one whose moral and spiritual perceptions are clear and distinct. Besides this, the men of strongest intellect and deepest feeling in a community are always sure to control and shape the current of opinion. Their views and feelings are more or less those of the whole community. Whom they praise, those will be generally praised; and whom they condemn, those will be generally condemned. Consequently, when a minister fails to command their respect, he will be almost certain to lose the respect of the rest of the community also, and so be deprived of all true power. And just here it may be well to remind our readers that mere learning, no matter how extensive, can never supply the place of native talent, or in any true sense be a match for it in any contest of real strength. When brought into contact, a diamond, though rough, will soon make apparent the inferiority of the most highly-polished quartz.

A third natural endowment requisite for a successful ministry is the gift of teaching. In virtue of his office, a minister should be above everything else an instructor. To proclaim the Word of God, and to explain, illustrate and enforce the same is his chief work; and as he does this well will his labors prove fruitful. It is true, by virtue of mere personal magnetism a

minister may draw together a large audience and induce many to unite themselves with the church of which he is pastor; but, unless he is possessed of aptness to teach, and properly instills the truth of God's Word into the minds of his hearers, his success will not be real or lasting. Those who are brought into the church merely by the personal attractiveness of the minister are generally of but little service to it. They are not persons that can be depended on, or that will be likely to stay with the church when the minister leaves it. Only those who are drawn to Christ by the power of the truth are truly won for Him and are a gain to His church. Hence the importance of a minister's presenting the truth as the truth is in Jesus, and of presenting it in such a way as to make it clear to the apprehension of his hearers. Now it is often supposed that if a man has any knowledge of any truth himself, he will always be able to teach it successfully to others. But this is by no means the case. Not every man that has knowledge can successfully impart it; neither can the art of teaching successfully be acquired by every one. The true teacher, like the true poet, is born, not made. To be highly successful in the imparting of knowledge, the teacher must be able to place himself in the position of the learner, and see things in his light. Moreover, he must have skill in adjusting his instruction to the wants and to the capacity of those whom he is instructing. But to be able to do these things properly, he must be possessed of breadth of intellect, quickness of perception and more than ordinary power of imagination—all of which things are gifts of nature, which may be improved by study and practice, but cannot be wholly acquired. Those who think of entering the ministry, before doing so, therefore, should satisfy themselves that they possess an aptitude for instructing others; for, if they are deficient in this respect, they cannot reasonably expect that any marked success would attend their labors as ministers of the gospel of Christ.

Still another requisite is the ability to organize and govern. The minister of the Gospel is not only a teacher, but also a leader and ruler. He stands at the head of the church which

he serves, and the proper administration of its affairs, therefore, to a great extent, depends on him. If he is able judiciously to organize the membership for church-work, and to give the right direction to their various efforts to advance the cause of Christ, his ability in this respect will go far to make his church a power in the community to which it belongs; for when pastor and people work together in harmony, success invariably crowns their labors. But if a minister is wanting in administrative ability, the congregation he serves is very apt to become divided into factions, and these can scarcely fail to hinder his work and destroy the influence of his preaching. There are, indeed, few persons who have had experience in the affairs of the church who are not acquainted with some one in the ministry who as a preacher would be a marked success if it were not that, by his mismanagement of congregational matters, he invariably causes disturbances among the people whom he serves in holy things. In fact, the greater number of church difficulties are due to ministerial mismanagement. It is not without reason, therefore, that St. Paul, in his First Epistle to Timothy, insists that an Elder should be one who knows how to rule well his own house, and claims that only such an one can take proper care of the Church of God. Now it is not an unusual thing for inexperienced persons to imagine that it is a very easy matter to exercise authority over others and to manage a congregation successfully. But in reality comparatively few persons possess the gift of doing so. The true leader and ruler, like the true teacher, is such by natural endowment, and not merely by training. Good judgment, self-control and self-possession, and decision and consistency of character are all required in order to success in this direction, and all these are qualities which nature must bestow if they are to be possessed in any high degree. Any very marked deficiency in any of these qualities will almost certainly cause failure in the ministry, and those, therefore, who are seriously wanting in these respects should not be urged to engage in this sacred calling or choose it for themselves. If they do so,

they will only enter on a course of trouble, as regards themselves and as regards others also.

The natural qualifications, to which attention has now been directed, we consider the most important. There are others, however, that are also highly desirable, such as fluency of speech, a good voice and a pleasing manner. But if these latter be possessed but in an ordinary degree together with the others, no one need fear of success so far as his natural endowments are concerned. Besides the qualifications already noticed there are, however, a certain number of others which must be acquired that are also indispensable to any marked success in the ministry. These latter we shall now consider.

And here a first place must be assigned to a thorough acquaintance with the contents of the sacred Scriptures. The minister of Christ should be emphatically a minister of the Word of God. It does not specially pertain to his calling to teach philosophy, or science, or literature, but it is his special mission to proclaim and expound to men the truths taught in the inspired books of the Old and New Testaments. But in order to proclaim these truths properly he must know them, and to know them properly he must have a correct knowledge of what is contained in the Scriptures. It is not necessary to enter into any proof of this, as the mere statement of the matter must make its truth apparent to all. It might be supposed, accordingly, that no one would think of entering the ministry without having first acquired such knowledge. But the misuse of Scripture in the pulpit, and the mistakes made by ministers in their reference to biblical statements and incidents, clearly prove that in some cases, at least, it is otherwise. Not a few ministers, as well as many church members, there is reason to believe, talk more about the Bible than they study it, and are more interested in the passing events and thoughts of men than in the facts and teachings of God's Word. Consequently their sermons, instead of abounding in the truths of divine revelation, abound rather in the current opinions of the day, and are little else than theological twaddle. Hence they fail to satisfy the minds and hearts

of those who hear them, and accomplish nothing in the way of building them up in the faith. To preach successfully one must, like Apollos, be "mighty in the Scriptures;" like Paul, declare unto men the "testimony of God." Only the truth as the truth is in Jesus can make men free and satisfy the wants of fallen and sinful humanity. Not by "the enticing words of man's wisdom," but by the "wisdom of God" as set forth in the holy Scriptures, are men made "wise unto salvation." All the great preachers of the church, from the Apostles down to our own times, have been men who were deeply versed in the Scriptures, and who from them drew the material for their sermons as well as the inspiration of their eloquence. It was especially by means of their knowledge of the Word of God that Luther and Zwingli and the other reformers were enabled to refute the errors of the Papacy and usher in the glorious reformation of the sixteenth century. What power there is in the simple presentation of the gospel, we think the success of Mr. Moody also clearly shows. That which more than anything else characterizes his preaching is its Scripturalness, and herein lies its strength and attractiveness.

Those who would labor effectually in the Christian ministry should, therefore, devote all the time they can to the study of the Scriptures. They should begin doing so as soon as they think of becoming ministers, and continue to do so as long as they live. For no amount of study will ever enable them to exhaust the riches of these sacred writings. On the contrary, renewed study will only discover greater treasures of wisdom in them. In their study a chapter here and there should not be merely read and meditated upon, as too frequently is only done, but the various books should all be separately examined in the most thorough manner, and their contents, as far as possible, critically analyzed and mastered. Especially should the purpose of each book, the relations of the different parts of the book to each other and to the general design thereof, and the practical bearing of the whole and the parts be carefully considered. In addition to this, the more important incidents in Biblical his-

tory, and the more striking and impressive statements of divine truth in the exact words of the inspired author, should be permanently fixed in the memory. Thus the mind will become filled with the truths of the Scriptures and with apt illustrations of the same, and the way be thoroughly prepared for the proper and effectual presentation of these truths to other minds.

In view of the importance of a thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures to those who would preach the gospel, it may not be out of place here to say that we are convinced that they should be more carefully studied than they usually are in our theological seminaries. Besides the exegetical instruction that is imparted, an effort should be made to acquaint the students with the whole Bible. If they were examined more thoroughly from time to time with regard to the special contents of all the books of the Old and New Testaments, and required to give a careful analysis of each one of them, and their knowledge of the Scriptures in this respect were more insisted on as an indispensable requisite to admittance into the Christian ministry, we feel assured it would result in great gain to the cause of Christ and His church.

But referring to theological seminaries reminds us that in order to assured success in the Christian ministry a regular course of academic and theological instruction is also necessary. Now and then a man may achieve success without such instruction, but as a general thing it is otherwise. From St. Paul down to our own times, the most influential preachers of the gospel have been men of superior education. Intellectual culture, no less than spiritual culture, is required by the ambassador of Christ who would deeply and enduringly impress the hearts and minds of men. For the religion of Jesus is not a mere matter of sentiment, as some would have us believe, but something which has to do with the whole man.

Academic training is needed for the proper development of the intellectual powers, and as a preparation for the successful prosecution of those studies which pertain to a full course of theological training. Then, too, the knowledge imparted in a

regular academic course of study is in itself almost indispensable to any one who would occupy the position of a public instructor. The general education and intelligence of the great body of the people has become such that a half-educated person, unless possessed of rare genius, can no longer command respect as a religious teacher. Then, too, philosophy and science in all ages have come more or less in contact with theology, and have exerted more or less influence upon it, sometimes for good and sometimes for evil. The Christian minister, accordingly, should know something of both, in order that he may not fall into serious error and do injury to the cause of truth by unnecessarily opposing true philosophy and science, or by seeking to harmonize Christianity with science and philosophy, falsely so-called.

As regards theological instruction, it may be truly said that a knowledge of the studies which it usually embraces is necessary to the proper apprehension of the teaching of the Word of God itself. We know that there are those who entertain different views, and who maintain that all that is required to understand the sacred Scriptures is to have the Spirit of God in the heart and to be possessed of the ability to read. But the gross ignorance which these persons mostly display in their interpretations of God's Word is the best proof to the contrary. That the possession of the Spirit of God is requisite to the right judging of Scripture there can be no doubt, for "the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." But the Scriptures have a human side as well as a divine, and for the understanding of what is human in them, human instrumentalities are necessary. On this account a knowledge of the languages in which they were originally written and of Biblical archæology and history, and of the principles of interpretation, must ever be indispensable to those who would completely possess their contents and be fully qualified to teach them to others. Without some acquaintance with Greek and Hebrew, a minister can never feel perfectly sure that he understands correctly the meaning of the words of the inspired writers, and will always be

at a great disadvantage whenever the correctness of the translation of the original is called into question by any one. So, without a knowledge of Biblical archæology and history and exegesis, he will be just as likely to misinterpret as to interpret aright what he reads, by considering the incidents and statements which claim his attention in the light of his own times, rather than in the light of the age to which they belong. Moreover, as Christianity is a progressive religion, and inasmuch as the truths of Revelation have not been given to men in the Bible in a systematic form, but in the way of history and practical admonition, it is also important to the Christian minister that he should be versed in the history of the church and in systematic theology. Wanting a knowledge of the first-named study, he will be unable to understand properly the present condition of Christian society, or to account correctly for many things which exist in the church as we now find it; while wanting training in the latter, he will have no clear conception of the ways of God with man, and especially of the great plan of redemption; and consequently he will be almost certain to present the truths of Scripture in a very injudicious, illogical and fragmentary manner. For as only he who has acquired a systematized knowledge of the natural world can satisfactorily explain its wonders, so only he who has attained to a systematized knowledge of the truths of Revelation can set them forth in such a way as will prove most conclusively their unspeakable value. The study of practical theology is also of great service. In it we have gathered together and arranged the wisdom gained by the experience of ages, as to the best way of teaching men divine truth and leading them in the way of righteousness. That every person entering the ministry requires such instruction, if he is to be guarded against making very serious and hurtful mistakes in discharging the duties of a shepherd of souls, can be questioned by no one whose opinion on the subject is worthy of respect. Training is necessary in order to high achievement in any sphere of human activity, whether religious or secular. The more thoroughly the mind of a man is disciplined by study, and

the greater the resources of knowledge at his command, the more likely will he always be to do his work well and realize grand results. It can scarcely fail, therefore, to be evident to every person who carefully considers the matter, that a regular course of instruction in theological studies, after a proper academic training has been received as a preparation to enter upon it, is, as a rule, an indispensable qualification for a successful ministry.

The various points to which attention has been called might have been enlarged upon and more fully discussed, and their importance would have abundantly justified so doing. But what has been said we hope is sufficient to show that the ministerial office demands both talent and training for its proper discharge, and that it is not wise for those who are deficient in these respects to seek admittance into this sacred calling, or for the church to induct them into it. The present age, more, perhaps, than any preceding age, requires an educated as well as a pious ministry, and those, therefore, who would preach the gospel should not be satisfied with anything short of thorough training for the work.

In conclusion it is hardly necessary to say that the views presented in this paper have nothing specially new in them. They are the views which the practical wisdom of the church has ever led her more or less to recognize and act upon, as is proved by the interest which she has ever manifested in providing for the proper instruction of those to whom she has intrusted the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments. But this only shows the more conclusively their correctness and importance, and should all the more induce the members of the Reformed Church to do all they can to further with their means the efforts that are now being made to strengthen and extend her literary and theological institutions.

IV.

"THE SLANG OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY."

BY REV. MAURICE G. HANSEN, A.M.

THE expression at the head of this paper stands in quotation marks. It is taken from the elaborate work of an eminent author—"History of England from the fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth, by James Anthony Froude, Charles Scribner & Co., New York"—and is a dark blot on one of its pages, Vol. ix., p. 269.

In the heat of controversy upon a topic which is of too exciting and inflaming a nature to be discussed with equanimity, when passion sways the judgment and wholly overrides it, such a phrase, hissed out from between the set teeth, can scarcely be excused; less so when, having fallen from the pen in an unguarded moment, it is permitted to remain in the manuscript which admits of a careful revision than when the mind has recovered its equilibrium. More decidedly reprehensible when it is uttered deliberately in the course of a calmly conducted discussion, it is increasingly liable to objection when it is traced upon paper with the same deliberateness. How severely, then, should it be denounced, when it is spoken neither in hot controversy nor in cool argument, but is written in the act of the dispassionate recording of historical facts with which it is not connected, either in the way of previous suggestion or in that of necessary explanation; simply thrown off, in unrestrained bitterness of spirit, a dark drop from a pen dipped in gall—a phrase without reason, without even the pretence of logic, without foundation in facts, without elegance of terms; a phrase which, allowed to be perpetuated in type, thus is made to glory in its shame.

Mr. Froude employs this most objectionable expression when he relates a part of the adventures of Mary, Queen of Scots. This lady who, appealing to the sympathy and the commiseration of posterity through the superiority of her physical charms, the readiness of her wit, the multitude of her sorrows, the strange vicissitudes of her fortunes, and the most tragical ending of her life, gathered around her person the glamour of romance which probably never will be dissolved, was no favorite of this historian. He spares no effort in the performance of the task which he has imposed upon himself, to divest this no doubt deservedly unfortunate princess of all the halo with which her admirers nevertheless persist in encircling her, and to place her before the world as the bold and the bad woman which, indeed, he hesitates not to name her in so many words.

It seems to have been the ambition of this author to collect within the vast crucible in his literary laboratory the principal characters of the period with which his history deals, and, after a course of treatment deemed adequate to the purpose, to bring them out thence the very reverse of what they previously were in the popular opinion which, because of its age, is already beginning to array itself in the garb of tradition. Henry VIII. becomes one "more sinned against than sinning,"—one of the greatest kings of England's royal line, a martyr to the good of the realm. As such he displaces the exalted sensualist, who, failing in his efforts to get a divorce from his first wife, set her aside to marry the second, whose decapitation paved the way for a union to the third, and so on, until the fifth had been lifted to the perilous height. Catherine of Arragon appears from the crucible a hard-faced, narrow-minded old woman, who betrays the blindness of her eyes by her inability to perceive how what is called a political necessity should render her willing to acknowledge the invalidity of her marriage and thus to ignore her wifehood; and her hardness of heart, by insisting that he who, according to divine and human laws, was her husband, should continue to recognize the claims which it could not be shown she ever had forfeited by negligence or unfaith-

fulness. Anne Boleyn comes forth from the alchemist's hands charming still in skin-deep beauty, but no longer the victim of an almost absolute monarch's caprice. There she stands upon the operator's table, in all the hideousness of moral defilement—an unfaithful wife, a recreant queen, a strumpet stained with incest; and Elizabeth, her daughter by her royal husband, afterward queen, emerges from the process to which she also is subjected in that wonderful laboratory, a coquette toward her English, Spanish and French lovers—a person without a religious sentiment in her heart, and changing the form of the pretence of it according as she was influenced by state policy, unreliable in her dealings with her Scotch, French, Spanish and Dutch neighbors, an unscrupulous miser who begrudged the money the expenditure of which was necessary for the comfort of her sailors who fought against the Armada, the sovereign who was lifted up into a false prominence upon a pedestal composed in large part of the genius of her—mark the word—*Protestant* subjects. Mary, the daughter of Henry VIII. and Catherine of Arragon, who succeeded her father upon the throne, undergoes not so great a transformation. The justness of the decree of Nemesis that her name shall descend with the stream of the passing ages, having the awful predicate "bloody" attached to it, is more than impliedly acknowledged, but her aspect as she, too, appears before us after treatment in the crucible, is such that the deeds by which that appellation was earned seem less horrible through the sympathy awakened for the woman who struggled during eight weary years for the supremacy of the Roman Catholic religion in the realm because its triumph involved the recognition of the legitimacy of her birth; and who died of a broken heart because her royal Philip of Spain, whom, strangely enough, she madly loved, was, after a short stay in England, rejected by her people, and left behind on the—to him—inhospitable shores of the sovereign mistress to whom he never returned.

Mr. Froude may be correct in the estimate which he formed of the several characters that have been named, and all who

differ from him may be very much in the wrong. By means of his reference to original records, his skillful groupings of indisputable facts, his positively asserted premises pointing to inevitable conclusions, and his cunningly inwoven surmisings, all these expressed in language of great beauty, in a style at one time so forcible as to seem able to exact conviction, and at another so winning as to appear possessed of the power to persuade into it, he may possibly succeed in gaining disciples to his views even from among those who began the perusal of his work in the idea that *their* notions of the character of the men and the women with whom he deals, formed upon the basis of the representations of it by numerous historians of good repute, could never be altered. He may urge, and not in vain, upon a multitude who behold the ghastly scene of Mary Stuart's execution, as drawn by his masterly pen, to stifle within themselves, as improper and wholly unbecoming, the feelings of deep compassion with which they regarded her ever since the day they learned to know her in her beauty, her vivacity, her temptations, her errors, her sorrows and her shocking death, and, to give free vent to the spirit of indignation justly excited by the detestable creature whose wicked, deceitful, adulterous and murderous soul was forced from a body whose charms were merely artificial, by the blow of the headsman who himself shrank from the disgusting exposure made by the fearful metamorphosis.

With all this we may have but very little to do, for an opinion, one way or another, concerning the personages of secular history, cannot have any influence upon the kind of estimate we shall form of, or the sort of treatment we are disposed to accord to, the grave questions the adequate knowledge of which pertains to the spiritual welfare of men. But when it is attempted to coerce the reader into an acceptance of the author's estimate even of the latter, the matter becomes so serious that the feeblest voice should be sustained in its effort to utter a protest. When Mr. Froude makes the effort at such a coercion, it is well, indeed, that the syren-song, alluring to its destruction the

soul which comes under its fatal spell, loses its sweetness ; that the captivating beauty of a smooth rhetoric being cast to the wind, the bitter spirit of enmity within is allowed to express itself in language in which there is a lack even of refinement, and the use is stooped to of such a phrase as "The slang of Protestant theology."

The connection in which it occurs is as follows : The escape of Mary Stuart from Lochleven Castle led to the battle of Langside, fought between her Roman Catholic cavalier followers and the troops of her half-brother, the regent Murray. The conflict, short but severe, resulted in the complete defeat of the former. Mary fled from the field, and, adopting the desperate resolution of seeking refuge with her "dear sister" Elizabeth of England, crossed the narrow arm of the sea which there flowed between the two kingdoms. Her first lodging was in Carlisle Castle. There, by order of the English Queen, who declined to see her in London until an investigation had been made into the charge of her complicity in the murder of her husband Darnley, she was placed in charge of Sir Francis Knollys, a stanch Protestant, and of Lord Scrope. Mary's agents at the English court were Lord Herries and Lord Fleming. The former was indefatigable in his efforts to secure the co-operation of Queen Elizabeth in everything that might possibly be undertaken to restore his mistress to the throne of Scotland, of which her Scottish Lords had deprived her, and which she herself had abdicated at Lochleven. Herries inquired what, in case the investigation into the circumstances of the death of Darnley resulted unfavorably to his mistress, would be the conditions on which England would enforce her restoration to the throne. It was answered that Mary must ratify the treaty of Leith, by which she renounced her claims to the English crown ; that she must relinquish her alliance with France ; that she must submit to be divorced from Bothwell and allow him to be punished ; and finally, that she must abandon the mass in Scotland and receive the Common Prayer after the form of England.

In the mean time Mary had been removed farther inland, to Bolton, and there Herries reported to her regularly. She well knew that the Lords Morton, Ruthven, Lindsay and others would persist to the last in refusing to permit the adoption of the Book of Common Prayer in the order of worship in the Scottish churches. She designed to outline this antagonism very clearly, and, throwing the onus of it wholly upon the shoulders of, as she called them, her rebellious subjects, to awaken toward them in the mind of Elizabeth a hostility which she shrewdly guessed would react in her own favor. She therefore wished to seem disposed not only to abandon her Romish prejudices, but even to conform to the Anglican ritual. She began to attend services in Bolton Church. She won the heart of Knollys by complacently listening to the castle chaplain as he declaimed against Papistry. Yes, "she even," says Mr. Froude, "learnt to use the slang of Protestant theology."

Before we quote the example Mr. Froude furnishes of this "slang," let us see what aid may be derived from this historian's own utterances concerning the subjects alluded to in this phrase, in the effort to ascertain the interpretation he himself would have us put upon its spirit and import.

The first ray of light upon this expression is reflected from his definition of religion. The quotation of this definition is pertinent, since the abstract idea of religion lies back of the concrete, theology, and more particularly still, Protestant theology.

"Religion," says Mr. Froude, on p. 560, Vol. xii., "is an attitude of reverence in which noble-minded people instinctively place themselves towards the Unknown Power which made man and his dwelling-place. It is the natural accompaniment of their lives, the sanctification of their actions and their acquirements. It is what gives to man, in the midst of the rest of creation, his special elevation and his dignity. Accompanying our race, as it has, from the cradle of civilization, it has grown with our growth, it has expanded with the expansion of knowledge, subject only to the condition that when errors have been

incorporated into religious systems, they have been exceptionally tenacious of their ground." This definition, which is a striking instance of loose writing, is an amplification of the assertion which had already appeared on p. 307, Vol. ix., to this effect: "The essence of religion is something which is held alike by Catholic and Anglican, Arminian, Lutheran, Calvinist, Samaritan or Jew." Whatever our author is as a historian, he is no theologian.

Additional light is thrown upon the phrase under discussion by Mr. Froude's definition of what he calls "The religion of Christ," and between which and "the Christian religion" he strangely enough draws a distinction. Describing the former, he says, on p. 303, Vol. ix., "Christ came bringing with Him the knowledge that God was not a demon, but a being of infinite goodness—that the service required of mankind was not a service of ceremony, but a service of obedience and love—obedience to the laws of morality, and love and charity toward man. In the God whom Christ revealed neither envy was known, nor hatred, nor the hungry malice which required to be appeased by voluntary penances, or bloody offerings. The God made known in the gospel demanded of His children only the sacrifice of their own wills, and for each act of love and self-forgetfulness bestowed on them the peace of mind which passeth understanding." In this definition of "the religion of Christ," *ὁ Χριστός*, the anointed, atoning and interceding Priest, as well as Prophet and King, is ignored, and "peace of mind" is declared to come by a different way than that announced by Paul in the word—"Being justified by faith we have peace with God."

"Now for this religion of Christ," says Mr. Froude, on p. 305, Vol. ix., "was exchanged the Christian religion." What, then, is the latter? He remarks, and as we read we seem to see the sneer upon his countenance, "The highest obedience was conceived"—by whom? Those who represented and taught this Christian religion—"to lie in the profession of particular dogmas on inscrutable problems of metaphysics; the

highest disobedience in the refusal to admit propositions which neither those who drew them, nor those to whom they were offered, professed to be able to understand. Forgiveness and mercy were proclaimed for moral offenses; the worst sins were made light of in comparison with heresy; while it was insisted that the God of love revealed by Christ would torture in hell-fire forever and forever the souls of those who had held wrong opinions on the composition of His nature, however pure and holy their lives and conversation might be." In this definition Mr. Froude says nothing original. The travesty was put to his hand centuries before he was born. The only singular thing is that *he* says "the Christian religion" *is* this; his predecessors and contemporaries say it is *not* this. The latter are at least logical in reference to the relation between the thing to be defined and the definition.

We are now prepared to admit the rays to be cast upon the phrase of which we are treating, from Mr. Froude's notions of the nature of, respectively, theology and Protestantism. On pp. 305, 306 *et sequitur*, he says: "God gave the gospel, the father of lies invented theology." Again: "Through Christ came charity and mercy. From theology came strife and hatred, and that fatal root of bitterness of which our Lord spoke Himself in the mournful prophecy that He had not come to send peace on earth, but a sword." Evidently, Mr. Froude is not a keen exegete.

"The reformation," he says, "was the beginning of a new order of things. The recognition that false dogmas had for many centuries been violently intruded upon mankind, and the consequent assault upon the authority which imposed them, were in reality a protest against the dogmatic system and admission of the rights of conscience. . . . Yet this, the greatest of all the consequences which flowed from the reformation was the furthest from the minds of the reformers themselves, and there were few among them who would not have been loud in deprecating so undesired a catastrophe. The first and greatest of them contented themselves chiefly with negation—protesting

against the lies with which the church of Rome was choking them. But as the struggle deepened, the fiery tempers which it developed could not rest till they had produced positive doctrines which they could inflict at the sword's point as remorselessly as their late tyrants. The guidance of the great movement was snatched from the control of reason to be made over to Calvinism; and Calvinism, could it have had the world under its feet, would have been as merciless as the inquisition itself. The Huguenots and the Puritans, the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other, were ready to make war with steel and fire against all which Europe for ten centuries had held sacred. Fury encountered fury, fanaticism fanaticism; and wherever Calvin's spirit penetrated, the Christian world was divided into two armies, who abhorred each other with a bitterness exceeding the utmost malignity of mere human hatred."

We have some idea, now, of Mr. Froude's conception of what constitutes Protestant theology. We understand, too, how it comes to pass that he did not feel deterred from speaking of its "slang." Victor Hugo and the two Dumas, father and son, mention the patois of the Parisian Canaille. Dickens speaks of the slang of the rabble of London and Liverpool. Some American writers have quoted the jargon of the denizens of the slums of New York and Chicago, and of the hoodlums of San Francisco. The illustrations furnished by these authors convince us that Noah Webster's definition of "slang," as "low, vulgar, unmeaning language," is a very mild one. Accepting it, however, as an exhaustive definition, does it apply to the example Mr. Froude furnishes of "the slang of Protestant theology?" His example is taken from the statement which Sir Francis Knollys makes, in a letter addressed to Lord Cecil, the grand secretary of state of Queen Elizabeth, concerning the conduct of Mary Stuart at Bolton: "seeming repentantly to acknowledge that her offense and negligence of her duty toward God had justly deserved the injurious punishment and disgrace done to her by her adversaries." Yes, this is the astonishing specimen of the low, vulgar and unmeaning language

of "Protestant theology," by the utterance of which the deposed Queen of Scotland sought to curry favor with the legal Head of the Anglican Church. Is it a wonder that the soul of the great English historian is filled with horror and indignation toward "the Christian religion," theologians, and Calvinists in particular?

Does Protestant theology inculcate, in the sentence which Mr. Froude quotes from the letter of Sir Francis Knollys, the following:

1. The loftier the eminence to which one is raised by God, the more numerous and the more pressing are the responsibilities toward Him, arising from this exaltation.

2. God is pleased frequently to punish, even in this life, those who show disregard of these responsibilities not only negatively in the way of negligence, but positively in that of the commission of the gravest crimes, by lowering the culprit from his high estate, and depriving him of all the emoluments and advantages connected therewith, and by plunging him into correspondingly deep abysses of misery and ruin.

3. In the execution of such righteous judgment God often uses as agents the very men who, under the contrary circumstance of the delinquent's faithfulness and obedience, would have been inclined to support and defend the rank and authority with which he had been invested.

4. In genuine repentance there is a recognition of the divine omniscience, which takes knowledge of every hidden as well as of every open sin; the divine sovereignty, against which every sin is an act of treason; of the divine justice, which cannot leave sin unpunished. In the very recognition of these things it traces a connection between the commission of sin and the enduring of calamity.

5. The individual consciously polluted with guilt pursues the course of duty and the path of safety when he abases himself before God in utter self-condemnation and owns the equity of his disciplinary Providence even in its acts of greatest penal severity; if Protestant theology, as such, inculcates these five

doctrines, then its slang, its low, vulgar and unmeaning language, surpasses the elegant rhetoric of the English historian who rants and raves about the things of which the natural heart has no knowledge, because it cannot discern the things of the Spirit of God, as far as the glory of the open face of the sun when it is in its zenith surpasses the cimmerian darkness so thick that it can be felt.

What a pity that an otherwise noble achievement of literature should be so defaced! How sad that a scholar should so far forget what he owes to himself and to his fellow-man as to permit himself to mar the results of his studies, designed to instruct and delight his readers, with the mire cast out from the fountains of a bitter prejudice. Happily, by means of the startling phrase that has been reviewed, he puts his readers upon their guard against the mischief that lurks in his volumes. We have reason, therefore, to be thankful that Mr. Froude, in the extremity of his hatred of "Protestant theology," did not draw his pen through the objectionable expression. The less experienced and the incautious are thus loudly bidden to beware, even when they are most disposed to yield to the fascination which is the effect of the perusal of his, in other respects, exceedingly interesting work.

V.

THE AMERICAN IDEA OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM. 1791—1891.

BY PROF. E. V. GERHART, D.D.

What is the ideal relation between the Christian Church and the Christian State?

From the time that Constantine the Great, the first christian emperor, issued his edicts granting to believers in Jesus Christ among the people of his empire the right to preach the gospel and worship God according to the faith and discipline of the Christian Church, this question has been a living problem. The endeavor to solve it consistently with civil authority and independence in civil affairs, and with spiritual authority and freedom in spiritual affairs, has through successive ages produced untold confusion and intense conflicts, and has entailed on the spiritual power and the civil power innumerable evils.

Concerning the authority of the State in matters of religion, Constantine and his times inherited the opinions of pagan Rome; and on this matter pagan Rome, pagan Greece, the chosen people, and all the kingdoms which antedate the birth of Christ were of one mind. Great as was the difference between the monotheism and the ennobling worship of the jewish nation and the mythologies of the gentile world, yet, as regards the connection between religious belief and civil rights, between religious worship and civil government, there was no essential difference. Government and religion were integral parts of one organization. The laws pertaining to sacrifices, festivals, oracles, and the priesthood were civil laws. A dishonor done to a deity or an offense committed against an established religion was an offense against the State. This idea, inherited from the

roman empire and supported by the jewish theocracy, passed over from judaism and paganism into the Christian community, where, without controversy, the idea was recognized to be the true principle. As a consequence of the transition of the emperor and the empire to Christianity, the union of pagan religion with the pagan State became the union of the christian religion with the christian State.

But the union, even during the fourth century, was neither peaceful nor auspicious. That the State and the Church are distinct ethical estates; that each has a sphere of action, a mission and an authority of its own; and that the two authorities cannot become one organization without friction or without injustice to the one or the other, are facts illustrated by history. Though not acknowledged nor understood by the leading minds of the Constantinian period, their force asserted itself in the turmoil and confusion that afflicted the empire.

I.

Prior to the adoption of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in 1791, we may in general recognize three forms assumed by the inherited union, each giving rise to its own method of dealing with the questions at issue between the two powers. All, however, have taken it for granted that the State had legislative authority over matters of religious belief and religious worship.

During the first three centuries Christianity was the proscribed religion. The Roman empire accorded to all the nations subdued by her legions the right to observe their own religions. Even within the metropolis every nationality might have its own altars and worship its own deities. The synagogue of the Jew was tolerated. To this law of liberty for all religions the religion of Christ was an exception. Why, it does not harmonize with my present purpose to inquire. The fact, in this connection, it is sufficient merely to note.

As the State was invested with the right to make laws concerning the ceremonies of worship, to build temples and cele-

brate religious festivals, the emperor, by implication, also had the authority to approve or condemn a new religion, to support it or destroy it. Christianity was offensive to pagan philosophy, pagan beliefs and pagan manners. The only attitude which the emperor could take towards its converts was that of aversion and hostility, and for him the only consistent method of dealing with them was to destroy them. The religion of Christ had no civil right to exist; and the worshippers of Christ had no right to live. According to Tertullian, this was the prevalent maxim of the persecuting emperors: *Non licet esse vos*. Nor, judging the roman government by the principles then universally held by the ruling classes, can we logically find fault with the emperors for the enforcement of the maxim.

After three centuries of proscription, the religion of the persecuted Nazarene attained a recognized position in the Græco-Roman empire. The opening of the fourth century witnessed a surprising outward elevation of Christianity, which was brought about by the introduction of the principle of toleration, announced in an edict issued conjointly by Constantine and his brother-in-law, Licinius, during the year 313, at Milan. It declares that every man has a "right to choose his religion according to the dictates of his own conscience and honest conviction, without compulsion and interference from the government."* Of this edict Mason says: "It is the very first announcement of that doctrine which is now regarded as the mark and principle of civilization, the foundation of solid liberty, the characteristic of modern politics."†

Though Constantine has the honor of being the ruler who first officially declared the rights of the individual conscience in matters of belief and worship, yet the full significance of the new principle in its bearings on the two powers, the spiritual and the civil, was not discerned either by Constantine or his imperial successors. Nor was the principle either applied or grasped by the great theologians of that age. The freedom of faith and worship declared by Constantine not only invested

* Schaff's Ch. Hist., vol. ii., p. 73.

† Ibid.

Christians with the same civil rights which were enjoyed by the devotees of pagan deities, but the Christian Church became a part of the civil organization. The empire took the form of a christian theocracy. The emperor had official rights in ecclesiastical affairs by virtue of his civil headship, and the bishops had some rights in the affairs of the empire by virtue of their spiritual office.

In point of fact, however, the freedom guaranteed to the Church amounted to no more than a release from proscription; and this release was a boon principally for those who were in sympathy with the imperial party. The right of the Church to enact her own laws and according to her own laws to govern her spiritual affairs, without interference by the civil authority, was neither conceded nor claimed.

But a criticism of the logical inconsistency then introduced may not be just to the age. To announce the principle that every man was at liberty to observe his own religion was a decided advance upon traditional public sentiment, and it was as much, perhaps, as in our times a sound judgment will warrant us to look for from a recently-converted Christian ruler, and from Christian theologians at the beginning of the fourth century. We might go even further and affirm that the spiritual, civil and social conditions were not then at hand for the development and application of the Constantinian principle of religious freedom in its bearings on the details of the difficult practical question concerning the relation of Church and State. Certain it is that, on the one hand, the Christian empire believed it to be one of its chief obligations not only to declare liberty of worship, but also to support, to endow and to aggrandize the Church by erecting edifices, endowing bishoprics, by supporting authoritative dogmas and protecting approved ceremonies of worship; and on the other hand, the Church believed it to be her right to receive stipends from the public treasury, to have the expenses of councils defrayed, and when there was division and strife, to have the party in ascendancy defended by the strong arm of the civil power. It could not be

otherwise than that, under such sort of civil protection extended over the Church, and with such ecclesiastical claims upon the State, perplexing complications would arise, and many wrongs be committed by the State upon the Church, if not by the Church upon the State. Thus the new principle announced by the edict of toleration was soon converted into a new form of bondage.

The right of the empire to protect and support the Church came within a very few years to mean the right to uphold accepted dogmas and the approved cultus. With this construction of State obligation came in at once the right of putting down by force the adherents of contrary theological opinions. The creed of the Council of Nice, 325, and other decisions of this council, became a part of the civil law. This creed it was incumbent on the empire to uphold. If incumbent to uphold Christian truth as expressed by authoritative dogmas, it was no less incumbent also to punish disobedience to truth. From this inference there was no escape. That authority is negative as well as positive is a universal principle. The State must require its citizens to keep the laws. If the laws are violated, due process must be instituted before the tribunals, and if the culprits be found guilty they must be punished according to the degree of criminality. As the accepted interpretation of Christian revelation was acknowledged to be a part of the law of the realm, disobedience to the accepted interpretation, or to the orthodox dogma, was a violation of Church law and of State law as well. Such a wrong done to Christian truth—that is, to the law of the realm—the civil ruler was bound to punish. He had the power to do it, and as head of the empire he was religiously bound to do it. And the penalty to be inflicted was civil as well as ecclesiastical, secular as well as spiritual, and might even be physical as well as moral. If he neglected this duty, if he failed with civil penalties to punish heretics, he would be responsible for the dishonor done to Christ by religious errorists. He would become *particeps criminis*, and would have to

answer for this wrong at the bar of God. The premises being granted, this conclusion is valid.

The civil and the ecclesiastical authority felt itself conscientiously shut up to the duty of persecution. It was a divine obligation to visit with severe penalties the persons who, by bringing in "damnable heresies," dishonored christian truth and defied the sacred laws of the State. The penalties inflicted were the severest penalties, because christian truth was the most sacred trust, and dishonor done to christian truth was the greatest wrong done to the State.

The practice of the civil persecution of heretics, from the fourth century and onward for ages, was supported by two additional prevalent opinions: the one opinion was that religious error may be overcome and destroyed by physical force; the other, that the use of external force was authorized by Scripture.

The age did not adequately distinguish between false beliefs and wrong conduct, between religion and morality, between illogical or perverse thought and evil deeds. It was assumed that a misdirected conscience might be silenced and the false action of the religious reason restrained and corrected on the same principle as rebellion against civil authority. This sentiment afforded strong support to the magistrate in the endeavor to enforce by the sword the laws against heretics. Though the sentiment ran directly into the face of the experience of Christians during their bloody persecutions under the pagan emperors of the first three centuries, when the well-known saying became proverbial that the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church, yet now, when Christianity had become the religion of the empire, the theory of the civil proscription of religious errorists or dissidents had the force of an axiom in civil and ecclesiastical government.

The other opinion was based upon a mistaken interpretation of Luke 14: 23—*compel them to come in*. This injunction occurring in our Lord's parable of the great supper was by the eminent theologian, Augustine, understood to justify and au-

thorize physical force in the endeavor to bring men into the ark of safety. *Compel them*, it was held, enjoined the use, whenever fealty to Christ required it, of the civil power to uphold sound doctrine by the punishment of error.

These two opinions—the one that errors of religious belief and thought may be restrained and overcome by civil penalties as really as by argument and moral suasion, the other that our Lord himself commanded the use of physical force—nerved the arm of the State and the Church against individuals and communities who held beliefs contrary to received dogmas or observed rites differing from the authorized worship. The persecution of errorists became a recognized duty. Loyalty to the head of the Church required it. Tolerance of errorists or the failure to employ both argument and civil power to suppress heresy was treason to Christ.

Nor are we now logically warranted in condemning the persecutions which for so many centuries were visited by Christians in power upon dissenting believers. Given the organic union of Church and State, given also the regnant principles concerning the spiritual vocation of the civil power, and we are inevitably shut up to the inference that the State must punish with secular disabilities, if need be with imprisonment and death, rebellion against the bishop no less than rebellion against the king.

In process of time another radical change was developed. The edicts of Constantine released the Church from subjection to pagan animosity, and accorded to her the civil right to exist. But the Emperor continued to be supreme. The Church, though honored and aggrandized, was an estate subordinate to the civil authority. This attitude could not be abiding. Conscious of spiritual freedom in union with her Head, the king of kings, she strove to rise and succeeded in rising to a position of co-ordinate authority; the five great metropolitan bishops claiming jurisdiction in the spiritual sphere equal to the jurisdiction of the Emperor in civil affairs.

Friction and conflict attended this double headship. By degrees the sense of limitation by the State became as unendur-

able to the Church as subordination; and the principle of ecclesiastical supremacy gained recognition. Affirmed by Leo the Great, the supremacy of the Roman See was firmly maintained and enforced by Gregory the Great, 590. From the seventh century onward this principle became more and more deeply rooted in the Roman episcopate. It was asserted, defended and enforced as opportunity offered and as the power of the Roman See grew. The Pope was the vicar of Christ: therefore the authority of the Pope was superior to the authority of the Emperor.

The consequences of this new departure were terrific conflicts between the Church and the State, between Popes and Emperors. The issue culminated in Hildebrand, who, in his controversy with Henry IV., had a two-fold experience. As the reigning Pope * he was defeated, but the principle for which he contended triumphed. The triumph was illustrated by his successors, especially by Innocent III. † and Boniface VIII., ‡ who crowned kings, deposed kings, released subjects from their allegiance to the throne and dictated terms of peace to contending kingdoms.

But as in the fourth century the sufferings inflicted upon christians by the pagan Roman Empire, issued under Constantine in the triumph of the Church, so in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the false supremacy of the Church over christian States provoked throughout Germany a widespread reaction of the nations, including kings, nobles and peasants against unevangelical ecclesiastical authority—a reaction that was very much strengthened by ecclesiastical abuses and papal feuds. Two popes, the one at Rome the other at Avignon in France, carried on a fierce, disgraceful quarrel for supremacy, each against the other, for the period of more than forty years, from 1378 to 1418. When the Council of Pisa, 1409, deposed both and elected a substitute in the person of Alexander V., the Church, instead of being reduced to order, was distracted by a triangular war. Each of the three, claiming to be the true

* 1073-1085.

† 1198-1216.

‡ 1294-1303.

pope, anathematized the other two. These violent papal dissensions passed the supreme power back into the hands of the State.

When, finally, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the great Protestant Reformation was ushered in by Zwingli in Switzerland and Luther in Saxony, though the Roman See claimed its authority to be supreme, yet actually State and Church were rivals, each struggling for the maintenance of superiority over the other. At this juncture the civil and ecclesiastical status of affairs bristles with contradictions. Confessedly the emperor acknowledged fealty to the Pope, and by the Pope he was crowned. But as a matter of fact, the Emperor asserted independent authority and exercised arbitrary power to the full extent of his ability. The attitude of kings, princes, dukes, electors and civil rulers generally, relatively to the Pope, was in sympathy with the contradictory attitude of the emperor. Church and State were one organization consisting of two distinct powers, each striving after supremacy. At one time the spiritual power was in the ascendant, at another the civil power; but when the fifteenth century opened, the preponderance throughout Europe, the papal states excepted, was on the side of the civil authority.

Thus it came that when the cantons of Switzerland, the kingdoms of Germany, England, Scotland, and the provinces of the Netherlands accepted the freedom of the Reformation, not only were Church and State united, but, by a sort of common understanding among the reformers and princes, the chief authority was in the hands of the civil power. Though Switzerland was a republic and Saxony a monarchy, yet Luther and Zwingli both appealed to the State, and availed themselves of its authority in protecting and furthering the work of evangelical reform. The idea of an evangelical Church independent of the State, maintaining its organization from its own resources and directing its affairs exclusively by its own spiritual authority, was no more a controlling principle in the Reformed and Lutheran Churches of the sixteenth century than such an idea had been

in the fourth century. Touching the relation of Church and State, the genius of the Reformation bore in its bosom potentially a new principle, but no actual change was introduced, nor did the Protestant communities develop a consciousness of the significance of the new latent principle.

True, the emancipation from papal tyranny, the doctrine that Holy Scripture was the final criterion of belief and discipline, and that forgiveness of sins was obtained only by true faith in Jesus Christ, were living germinal forces which wrought powerfully in Protestant nationalities, though amid many contradictions, toward the evolution of the American idea of religious freedom; nevertheless the Reformation age did not emancipate the Church from bondage to the State. In all Protestant countries, in the Swiss Republic no less than in the monarchies, the inherited alliance was perpetuated; and the theory respecting the right and duty of the State to support sound doctrine and suppress heresy maintained itself without decisive opposition, at least during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Judged from the standpoint of his times, Calvin merits no censure for his assent to the execution of Servetus. The idea of religious freedom which has been developed from Reformation principles in the United States of America during the present century is not the standard of a just judgment on the persecutions of Great Britain, or the Continent of Europe, or in the colonial period of New England. Simple justice, however, requires the statement in passing that the principle of Christian freedom wrought with much force in the lives of leading reformers. There was some just sense of contradiction between the genius of Christianity and civil penalties inflicted for religious errors. Calvin assented to the burning of Servetus with manifest reluctance; nor did he waive his opposition until all his efforts to supersede the necessity of the execution had failed. The horrors of the Inquisition of Torquemada, 1483, would have been an impossible thing within the dominions of any Protestant prince.

This brief review of salient points in the history of the

problem seemed to me to be important in order to bring somewhat definitely before the eye of the mind the background of the American era. We may, during eighteen centuries, distinguish a threefold condition of the Church relatively to the State. During the first period she was oppressed and persecuted. Next, in 313, came the outward triumph over her foes; when, we may perhaps say, she was invested with authority co-ordinate to the State in matters spiritual and political, though it must be conceded that the balance of power lay in the hands of the emperor. The third noteworthy position of the Church appears in the Middle Ages, most decisively represented by Hildebrand or Gregory VII., Innocent III. and Boniface VIII., when kings were the subjects of the Pope,—a period of outward supremacy of comparatively short duration. With this exception extending through a few centuries, the Church, whether Greek Catholic, or Roman Catholic, or Evangelical Catholic, in spite of her protests and contrary efforts, has been; as to outward condition and her civil relations, through all the ages of her history, the subject of the State. The degree of her subjection has varied with the times and with the animus of government, but she has always and everywhere been limited and restrained, if not fettered and enthralled.

II.

Of the strivings of the Church after emancipation from false subjection for eighteen hundred years the freedom of religion guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States may be regarded as the final outcome. The seed was for the first time sown by Constantine; for ages it slumbered or had a doubtful growth, but it did not perish. More vigorous seeds of the same kind were sown by the Reformers,—seeds which at once began to take root, and, since the sixteenth century, have been germinating in all Protestant lands, causing intense and persistent struggles, especially in the English-speaking nations. But the ripe fruit of the Reformation idea of freedom did not

appear until 1791, when the first amendment to the Federal Constitution was adopted.

The Federal Constitution, as originally framed by the general Convention of the Thirteen Colonies, and as it went into force in 1789, is on all religious questions negative. There is a genius of civil and religious freedom pulsating in the arteries of this extraordinary creation prophetic of a truth in process of ripening; but itself observes in its words entire silence. It speaks neither of God, nor of Christ, nor of the Church, nor of religion; though the large majority of the framers were, if not church members, positively in sympathy with Christianity. For the first two years after its adoption, viewing the situation at that time from the present attitude of the civil power, two contrary possibilities appear to have been latent in our organic law. Some solemn questions were pressing for an answer: What does this silence about religion signify? Does it mean entire independence of Christianity? or, still worse, hostility? Or may this silence bear an opposite interpretation? May it signify a profound sense both of the intimate connection and of the wide difference between these fundamental interests, the civil and the spiritual?

The silence of the Constitution on religion is due to the operation of various causes. Some were *negative*.

Different forms of christian faith and discipline were prevalent in the Colonies: in Maryland, Roman Catholicism; in Virginia, Anglicanism; in the Carolinas, French Reform; in Pennsylvania, Quakerism, associated with different types of the Reformed Church and the Lutheran Church; in New York, the Reformed Church of Holland; in the New England States, Congregationalism and Independency, —not to speak of other variations of christian belief possessing some strength in every colony. No one historical branch of Christianity had the ability, whether the desire or will was at hand or not, to assert controlling influence.

Another cause of this silence may have been, and probably was, the influence, on some prominent men, of the infidelity

then dominant in France. A tremendous social upheaval, largely due to the disintegrating forces of skepticism was just then in progress,—an upheaval which doubtless affected the mind of the American people, especially as there was prevailing a lively sense of gratitude to France for important aid afforded during the Revolution. Indeed, there was active among us a confusion of anti-Christian elements: French Naturalism, English Deism, German Rationalism, to which we might add anti-churchly tendencies, such as German Pietism, English and German separatistic sectarianism.

These influences were all against the recognition of religion by the new government; and we must make due account of their potency in the endeavor correctly to estimate the causes which combined in producing the final result.

But the causes of the silence of the Constitution on religion were far from being exclusively negative. Underlying this novel status of the two Powers brought about in history by the providence of God there were also *positive* Christian principles. Mainly to the operation of these positive forces is due the new character of religious freedom in the United States. To support this general judgment there are at least *three* things which merit special consideration.

As *first* I name the traditional reverence for Christianity among the people of the American colonies, and the hearty appreciation of its supreme value. Of the men who proclaimed the Declaration of Independence, who, for seven long years, persisted amid numerous hardships in carrying on the war of revolt against George III., and framed the Federal Constitution, the large majority represented communities of people who, for the love of Christ, had suffered persecutions in England and on the continent of Europe, and who, relinquishing their homes, sacrificing their property and turning their backs on their native land, had braved the perils of the ocean and fled into the howling wilderness of the New World that they might enjoy freedom of faith and worship. The Puritans of New England, the Reformed from France, from Switzerland

and the Palatinate who had settled in the Carolinas, in the wilds of Pennsylvania and along the Hudson, the Quakers and a large body of Lutherans were refugees from continental tyranny. The Hollanders of New York, the Episcopalians of Virginia and the Roman Catholics of Maryland held firmly by the spiritual inheritance bequeathed to them by their forefathers.

True, Jefferson constructed his own New Testament from the text of King James' version. Though he may represent a large minority, yet even this class of dissenters from the creed of Christendom recognized the moral worth of Christianity, and venerated Christian institutions. Thomas Paine was the exponent of a comparatively small circle. Though he traduced the Bible, his unbelief did not carry him beyond deism. He was neither an atheist nor a materialist. His views of human rights and of civil freedom, in spite of his blasphemies, reveal the plastic influence of christian truth in the formation of his opinions respecting the dignity of man.

Born in the bosom of an intelligent Christianity, brought up under the preaching of the Gospel, and rooted in the rich soil of christian civilization, the framers of the Constitution were men whose ethical sympathies, whose habits of social life and views of civil authority had all been fashioned by faith and reverence; the departure of some of them from orthodox beliefs and from the standard of christian morality to the contrary notwithstanding. Such a body of men would not, from hostility or aversion, maintain silence on religion in framing the new organic law of the nascent Republic.

The *second* important consideration bearing on this question is the historical fact that religion is formally recognized by the Colonies in at least two solemn national documents. The First Continental Congress, composed of delegates from nearly all the Colonies, assembled at Philadelphia, September 5th, 1774, and continued in session until October 26th of the same year. This Congress drew up and published a solemn *De-*

claration of Rights, in which occur the following significant words:

"The good people of the several Colonies (then follow the names of all the Colonies except Georgia), justly alarmed at these arbitrary proceedings of Parliament, have severally elected, constituted and appointed deputies to meet, and sit in general congress in the city of Philadelphia, in order to obtain such establishment, as that their religion, laws and liberties may not be subverted."

Among the three important matters with which this solemn declaration of the First Continental Congress was concerned,—namely, religion, laws and liberties,—it is the interest of *religion* that stands first.

The Second Continental Congress assembled in Philadelphia, May 10th, 1775, and continued its sessions during our Revolutionary War. This Congress issued the Declaration of Independence. In addition, it prepared a plan of confederation to be entered into by the Colonies, consisting of twenty articles. The ratification of these articles by the Thirteen States was completed March 1st, 1781; on the 2d day of March, 1781, Congress assembled in virtue of this act of confederation, which might be called the provisional constitution of the American Republic. This instrument recognizes religion in the third article. The article runs thus:

"The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever."

Here, as in the Declaration of Rights, among different interests that might be put in jeopardy by hostile force or attack, the first one named is *religion*.

In addition, I merely note the significant fact that the General Convention of delegates, assembled in Philadelphia, 1787, by which the Federal Constitution was framed and of which George Washington was chairman, availed itself, by a unanimous vote, of the sacred offices of the christian religion.

The *third*, but not the least, positive evidence deserving consideration is the genius of the document itself, the Federal Constitution. The idea of the organic union of all the people under supreme federal authority, of an elective chief magistrate, of the relative independence of the States, and of the sacred rights of persons; the evident purpose to maintain the authority of law without infringing the freedom of the individual, to protect the family and social rights without exposing the people to the danger of anarchy, and to administer justice between man and man in the spirit of christian righteousness,—these fundamental principles characterizing this instrument, are an inarticulate acknowledgment of the religion of Jesus Christ, which is more significant than the use of the word "religion" in the Articles of Confederation and in the Declaration of Rights. These principles, as they are built into the structure of our organic law, did not grow on pagan soil, nor were they evolved from the Naturalism of France, nor from the Deism of England, nor from the Rationalism of Germany. Outside the sphere of messianic revelation even their germs did not exist. Until the leaven of Christianity had laid hold of the social organism and had wrought in civil polity for eighteen centuries, these principles did not blossom. Their ripest fruit is our Federal Constitution. It may be pronounced the best exponent of the genius of Christianity in its relation to national government and all civil affairs. Hence the silence of the Constitution on religion must, in my opinion, be accounted for on grounds other than conscious aversion or skeptical indifference to Christianity.

That we are justified in this religious estimate of the General Convention of 1787, and in giving a positive interpretation to the silence on religion of our organic law, appears from the action on the subject of the First National Congress. The general religious sentiment of the nation and the affirmative spirit inhabiting the Constitution were among the first things that gained formal expression. By the first Congress ten Amendments were framed and approved. They were sub-

mitted to the Legislatures of the several States, and by them adopted. At the head of the list stands the amendment on the question of religion. It is expressed in a few well-chosen words, as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Like the Ten Commandments, and obeying the common method of formulating laws, this momentous amendment is as to form negative; but not as to contents. Its implications are all positive. To the end which was to be reached a categorical negative expression of the judgment of the nation was in every way better suited than an affirmative formula.

This prohibition to make a law respecting an establishment of religion binds the federal law-making power, Congress; not the people.

The people of each State had their religious beliefs and their forms of religious worship. In some States the civil power and the spiritual power were by law united. The amendment implies that religion is a living interest of the people, and is by them supported. The prohibition restrains only the federal authority. Of still more positive significance is the second clause. The authority of Congress to make a law prohibiting the free exercise of religion is interdicted. Hence the free exercise of religion becomes a right, which is accorded and guaranteed to all the people of the United States.

More than this first amendment enacted was not necessary. The religious bodies of the country wanted recognition by the supreme law, the civil right to existence, the freedom of speech and of the press, the freedom to assemble peaceably and to organize at will; and all these rights independently of civil permits or of any regulative oversight by the government. Such relative independence of the authority of the State was granted to religion by this amendment and sealed by its formal adoption. By this transaction the christian religion, for the first

time in the history of the world, attained the boon of civil freedom. In 1791, not yet one hundred years ago, let it be noted, the Church of Jesus Christ came really into the possession of the freedom and independence which are the product of her own heavenly inspiration. The fetters of her bondage were broken; at the same time the right of organization and of the exercise of spiritual authority was acknowledged and ratified. Some of the important things expressed and implied by this federal enactment are the following:

1. The Christian religion has the right of organized existence. The right is acknowledged and confirmed by the organic law. No proscription, no persecution is legally possible. The prerogatives guaranteed by the Constitution are independent of any civil supervision. In matters of doctrine, of worship, of organization, of self-support and of charitable ministrations, religion is beyond all legislative control. To this freedom of action Congress can set no limits.

That a religious organization may not violate any article of the Federal Constitution, nor violate any law passed in pursuance thereof, does not imply limitation contrary to the rational construction of the civil right of independent existence. Such restraint, if restraint it may be called, is a principle intrinsic in the idea of normal freedom. It is none other than the limitation which defines every branch of the government. Congress is bound by the Federal Constitution, in virtue of whose authority alone Congress exists. Each State is in all her departments held by the Federal Constitution within definite limits. Religion is as free as any State in the Federal Union. Religion is as free as the national Congress.

2. The civil freedom of religion under our Federal Constitution is of a two-fold character.

Congress cannot make a law respecting the establishment of a religion. In this regard Christianity and Judaism, Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, the Reformed Churches and Lutheranism, Episcopacy and non-Episcopacy, Methodism and Quakerism, all stand on the same basis. Any new religious

belief, any novel rights of worship, may arise and be perpetuated without challenge; provided only that no law of the land be transgressed. Congress can take no action which aims at establishing any one to the exclusion or disadvantage of others. But this limitation of Congress expresses only one aspect of the law.

There is another limitation of Congress equally important. Congress can make no law respecting the prohibition of any religion. The Jews may build their synagogues, the Friends their meeting-houses, Roman Catholics their cathedrals; and Lutherans, Reformed, Moravians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Methodists may put up their churches, preach their doctrines, worship with a liturgy or without it, and assemble at mid-day or at midnight. No law can interpose a veto. No civil officer can subject a worshipping people to any espionage.

3. The freedom of religion includes free speech and a free press. No man can be called to account by the civil authority for preaching the Gospel according to the standards of his church, nor forbidden the use of the press in furtherance of his religious opinions. The people have guaranteed to them the unrestricted privilege of organizing, of publishing, of teaching without let or hindrance.

The limitations imposed by morality or by loyalty, rightly construed, are no restriction. To say that no religion may go counter to the Constitution of the Republic or of any State nor violate any statutes enacted conformably to the organic law, is simply to emphasize the civil freedom of a religion in distinction from license or anarchy.

4. If Congress has no authority to make a law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, then by our federal law religion has *guaranteed* to it some momentous rights.

Not only has a religion the right to exist; not only has it the right of organization, the right to teach and to worship God according to its own order; but in the lawful exercise of these

rights a religion has a claim on the State to protection. If a religion has such civil rights, such rights under the Federal Constitution, it follows that the general government and the State governments organized in pursuance of the Federal Constitution are bound by moral obligations to religion. The State has guaranteed freedom to religious organizations; therefore religious organizations have the right to the lawful use of this freedom. Within her appropriate sphere the State is obliged to maintain the liberties of religious organizations against infringement or invasion. For instance, a church has the right to hold property agreeably to her order and discipline. A church has the right to worship God without molestation. Every organization or body corporate has the right to make contracts, and before the civil court to claim the enforcement of them. In these respects, as in many others, the State, whenever the occasion arises, is bound to protect a church against disturbance or injustice with the strong arm of judicial or executive power.

These propositions may perhaps express more in detail than was consciously present to the mind of the First National Congress, or of the American people in 1791. In the nature of the case, the manifold import of the article on religion, on freedom of speech and the freedom of the press, could not at once be fully understood, nor its far-reaching influence be forecast. Time and various occasions were necessary to develop the wealth of the general idea.

At first there was some uncertainty as to the adjustment of the relations of the two powers. It was evident on the face of the article that Congress could neither establish a religion nor forbid its free exercise. By implication the several States were also bound by this two-fold prohibition. But it was not certain during the immediately succeeding decades what attitude the Federal and State governments would in course of time occupy, or what attitude under the provisions of the law they ought to occupy, towards the institutions of the christian religion.

Did the categorical negatives of the amendment mean only *negation*—a separation of Church and State? Was the govern-

ment required or authorized or expected to be wholly disconnected from religion? Or would the national government and the State governments assert their authority in defense of the civil rights of the Church? When her civil rights are believed to be in jeopardy, will the genius of the Constitution accord to the Church a standing in court? May the Church seek redress by carrying a question in dispute before the civil tribunal? Or if the Church has a right to take a case before the courts, how will the courts deal with it? Will they acknowledge the validity of ecclesiastical law?

These and other cognate questions were pending. The simple adoption of the Amendment had not answered them. In these novel circumstances there was some suspense. There was a possibility that the government might occupy toward the Church either an attitude of cold indifference or an attitude of appreciative sympathy. The government in its several departments might entirely ignore the claims of religion or acknowledge its divine authority. The letter of the law might justify either alternative. Nor was it at first certain on what pre-supposition or in what spirit the law would be honored. There were times in the early history of our national independence when there was wavering and uncertainty as to its interpretation. It was a question whether its negative form or its positive import would ultimately prevail.

But those times of uncertainty have been resolved into confidence. The positive truth latent in the Constitution was long ago recognized; especially during the last fifty years of our history has it been affirmed and applied. The interpretation put on that article by Congress, by the executive branch of the government in its several departments, by the Federal courts and State courts of justice, fully supports the positive character of the American idea of religious freedom, as I have endeavored, under four notations, briefly to describe it.

It is in place here to specify several particulars. Both Houses of Congress have a chaplain. The chaplaincy is a part of the organization of the army and navy; also of our naval

and military schools. For the payment of the salaries of chaplains an appropriation is made, as for other civil officers. All branches of the government observe Sunday—the legislature, and the judiciary, and the executive, the post-office and the national schools. Some recognition of the day may also be predicated of the army and navy: of the marine on ship-board, and of the soldier in the garrison. Of course I do not mean that there are no desecrations of Sunday, nor that there are not times, nor places, nor occasions when Sunday observance entirely disappears. But I mean that a broad line of distinction is drawn between the first day and all other days of the week, Sunday being recognized by the different branches of government to be the day of rest from ordinary labor, and of divine worship.

Further, to any religious organization in its corporate capacity our courts of justice are accessible. A question in dispute between two religious bodies, or between two parties of the same religious body, or between an individual and the organization of which he is a member, has a right to be heard and to be adjudicated. This proposition is true in relation to all issues arising on a question of contract. Suits are tried and decided according to the ecclesiastical law to which the parties at issue are subject. The cases which certify the right of a church to a standing in court, and illustrate the honor to religion done by the federal and State judiciaries when church questions claim investigation and decision, are numerous.

Though the existence of religion is recognized, and religious organizations are wholly free and are protected in the enjoyment of their freedom, though the services of religion enter into the practical activities of our national government, yet the relation between the State and the Church involves some important questions that are not yet settled. They are in process of adjustment, and there is good reason to believe that in time to come, as in time past, the genius of American freedom dwelling in our organic law will gradually work out a solution of pending problems,—a solution that will be true to the wholeness of the American idea

respecting the unity of order and liberty, of authority and independence.

To sum up the results of this inquiry into the American idea of religious freedom, several things may now be definitely affirmed:

The Church and the State are distinct. Each organizes itself on a basis of relative independence. Each maintains its organization from its own resources. The State is under no obligations to give financial support to the institutions of religion. A Church is not required to obtain a license from the civil authority either to effect an organization or to modify it. The Church may purchase ground, may erect a house of worship, collect money from her members or friends, either for her own support or for the support of her charities, without question or challenge from the State.

This separation of the two powers does not mean any indifference of the State to the Church, much less aversion. The relation, on the contrary, is a relation of sympathy and friendship. The two powers are joined by an ethical bond. The Church honors the State. Every approved order of public worship includes prayers for civil rulers, for the maintenance of civil authority, for the perpetuity of peace and for restraints upon wickedness. By her teaching, her discipline and her benevolent activities, the Church relieves the sufferings and elevates the condition of the poor, promotes public morality and supports the wholesome industries of our civilization. In turn, the State honors religion; not one branch of the Church to the exclusion of another, but the common faith and the recognized institutions of Christianity. The use of the oath, the observance of Sunday, the chaplaincies, days of thanksgiving proclaimed by Governors and Presidents, all bear witness to the reverence of the Federal government and of our State authorities for the religion of Christ. In the exigencies of distress, as during the dark days of our late Civil War, or whenever the occasion may require it, the government exercises the right to call to its aid the services of eminent ministers of the gospel.

The rights of religion, guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, our courts of justice have been unequivocally affirming. No assembly of people convened for religious purposes may be molested. The privileges of public worship are protected by our statutes; and any violation of these statutes our courts punish with severe penalties. The mighty arm of civil law upheld by judicial authority is the shield alike of all classes, low and high, rich and poor. Sitting in judgment on no religious belief, criticizing no rites of worship, calling no man to account for his religious tenets, and giving the widest scope to religious teaching, to educational institutions and methods of charity,—our courts defend all the rights of religion, lawfully asserted, under the freedom guaranteed by the First Amendment. They recognize the right of every religious body to enact its own laws, to enforce its own discipline and observe its own customs. To each and all they accord a standing at its bar; they hear all church questions coming within their jurisdiction, and decide them on the basis of the regulations and the discipline which the parties at issue have established for their own government.

These are some of the principles which enter into the American idea of religious freedom, as this idea has been affirmed and gradually developed during the first century of our national existence. The State is free from the legislative authority of the Church. The Church is free from the legislative authority of the State. Each has its own vocation. Each moves in its own sphere. The two spheres are distinct; but not divorced. Though a sound morality is inseparable from true religion, yet the difference between religious belief and individual conduct, between the worship of God and social morality, is recognized by both. The State upholds and protects the free exercise of religion; but individual conduct and social morality are circumscribed by the civil law of righteousness; for the State draws the line between the right and the wrong, between justice and injustice, defining the liberty of action by the difference between the morally good and the morally evil. Their different

interests are ethically inseparable. The honor and prosperity of the State, by common consent, depend on the divine blessing, and on the christian virtue prevalent in all branches of the civil administration. On the other hand, the security of the Church and the progress of the christian religion depend largely on the freedom and protection guaranteed by the State.

The progress of our country in civil and social affairs and the progress of Christianity presuppose reciprocal sympathy and fidelity. The christian religion is the only true foundation of social and public righteousness; christian righteousness is the only security of a republican government and of democratic institutions. Concern for her own safety and the perpetuity of her liberties must inspire the State with deferential respect for the ethical and spiritual support afforded by the Church. In turn, the Church needs the kind of freedom and independence which by her organic law the Republic has secured to religion.

The educational question and Mormon polygamy involve some issues that have not yet been finally adjusted. But the adjustment will come with the further legitimate development of the American idea. If true to the genius of the Federal Constitution, this progressive development will recognize the civil sphere and the religious sphere as distinct, without arraying either against the other. It will maintain their harmony and vital inter-dependence without subjecting the free exercise of religion to the law-making power of the State, or the recognized prerogatives of the State to the will of any religious organization. But the truths of Christianity common to all branches of the Christian Church will, as I believe, be honored in the school; and the truth of monogamy, the only foundation of a pure family and social life, will be upheld and vindicated by the educational training of the Church and the unyielding authority of the State. How these ends may be accomplished it is no part of my purpose now to consider.

To the question with which this paper began: What is the ideal relation between the Christian Church and the Christian State? the answer may now be given, that the solution of this

irrepressible problem by the Federal Constitution and the development of its principles actualize the momentous truth announced by the celebrated edict of Constantine, 313, with more consistency and larger fullness than was ever declared or experienced during fifteen centuries of conflict and doubt. The United States of America is the only land on the face of the globe where Church and State are both free, where civil authority and ecclesiastical authority are each relatively independent; yet the State honors the Christian religion and the Christian Church honors the State, whilst each within its own sphere asserts its distinctive prerogatives and exerts its influence for the advantage and welfare of the other.

Does not the year 1891, the centennial anniversary of the adoption of the first Amendment to the Federal Constitution, deserve to be celebrated with thanksgiving by the people of these United States? especially by all branches of the Christian Church in our favored land who are enjoying the civil freedom and civil protection which by all monarchies and all republics were denied to the christian religion for eighteen centuries? To say the least, next to 1776, as to momentous significance for the rights of man and the interests of Christianity, stands in the annals of American history the year 1791.

VI.

THOUGHTS ON THE UNITY OF THE VISIBLE CHURCH, AND THE RE-UNION OF THE CHURCHES.

BY REV. C. R. LANE, PH.D.

THE Church, viewed as to its essential nature, is composed of all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The faith which unites to Christ, while it is itself invisible, is made manifest by its fruits. Enoch walked with God; Lot, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with the unlawful deeds of the ungodly; Abraham was willing to offer in sacrifice even the child of promise; Moses refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; and Paul was ready, not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus.

In such ways, faith in Christ naturally makes itself known, and the people of God confess that they are strangers and pilgrims on the earth. With reasonable certainty they are known to us, but with absolute certainty they are known only to the All-seeing eye of God. Taken in this sense, therefore, the Church is invisible; but it has pleased God that the followers of His Son should be known, not only as their obedience makes manifest their piety, but also as a Body visibly separated from the world. All, therefore, who in the way of God's appointment credibly profess to be followers of the Lord Jesus Christ are members of the visible Church.

During what may be called the Adamic Dispensation of the Covenant of Grace, believers in Christ were visible by acts of worship by way of sacrifice. Abel brought, as an offering to the Lord, the firstlings of his flock, and the fat thereof; Noah

built an altar unto the Lord and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl and offered burnt offerings on the altar; and Abraham, in several recorded instances, worshipped the Lord by offering sacrifices. But when God made with Abraham the Covenant recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, the visibility of the Church was complete, for the people of God were then separated from the world, not only in the natural way of manifesting faith by obedience and acts of worship divinely appointed, but also by the Sacrament of Circumcision; and this Church, thus separated and distinguished from the world, made visible as an organization, is one Church. For, in the first place, it is the manifestation of one and the same vital principle.

In the Scriptures the Church is said to be the Body of Christ, having, indeed, several members, but all pervaded by one common life. It is one Family, one Household of faith, with one Father and one elder Brother, and animated by one Spirit, growing up in likeness to one Head and sharing in the same inheritance. It is one Olive-tree. The Jew was broken off and the Gentiles grafted in; and again, the Jew, if he continue not in unbelief, shall be grafted back into his own, not another, Olive-tree. All, therefore, without distinction of Jew or Gentile, if they are in the Church, are branches of the same tree, and together, equally, they partake of the same root and fatness. They are one; for as one vital principle develops one tree, so the one life of Christ in His people develops one Church—that living Temple in which God dwells, and from which He dispenses His favors, thereby making known unto principalities and powers in heavenly places His manifold wisdom and grace.

This statement agrees with the present state of the Jews viewed in connection with their promised future state. Now, the children of Abraham look through the institutions of Moses as through a veil obscuring sight; but when they shall turn to the Lord the veil shall be taken away. Then through the same institutions, no longer as an obscuration, but as an aid to vision, they will see Christ the more clearly and recognize Him the

more confidently as the Hope of Israel. With this view also agrees the admission made by the Apostle Paul when confronting his represented nation, before the Roman authorities. After defending himself against the specific charges made against him, he adds: "This confess I to thee, that after the way which they call schism, so I worship the paternal God, believing all, namely, those things according to the law, and those things written in the prophets." To the same purport the same apostle writes to the Church at Philippi: "Beware of dogs, beware of evil-workers, beware of the Concision, for we are the Circumcision, 'the divinely-appointed, historic, unchallenged, visible Church,' which worship God in the Spirit and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."

The visible Church, therefore, is one as the outward form of the same inward life.

Secondly. The visible Church is one, because the condition of membership in it is ever the same, namely, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Saving faith is the very thing professed, and as far as it does not exist, the society is not a Church. An association may contain all moral excellence, but without the grace of Christ it is not a Church. It may have for its object the most noble ends, and seek them by the most laudable means; it may teach the ignorant, clothe the naked, care for the sick and bury the dead; its organization may be complete and its visibility as the shining light; but without faith in Christ as the professed ground of membership it is not a Church, nor yet with faith is it a Church, unless the faith is professed in God's appointed way. On the other hand, faith may be professed in the most regular, Scriptural way, yet if the faith professed does not in fact exist, it is a mere shell, a delusion or a fraud, destitute of the principle of life; no more a Church than a body without a soul is a human being. Faith, the formative principle, is, of course, essential; and it is ever the same. It is the same as to its origin—a divine gift; the same in its nature—taking Christ for wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption;

it is directed by the same rule—the Scriptures; guided to the same end—obedience; and it secures the same reward—an eternal weight of glory. In this respect, therefore, and for this reason, the visible Church is one.

Thirdly. The visible Church is one, because it is separated from the world—that is to say, it is made visible by the same distinguishing marks or Sacraments. The Sacraments, or Seals of the Covenant of Grace, and the symbols of its promises are Circumcision and the Passover, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and they are the same respectively because they represent the same truths in different aspects and with different adjuncts. Circumcision and Baptism both assume that human nature is corrupt and must be purified, while Baptism points more directly to the efficient agent in the work of purification—the Holy Ghost.

The truth is the same, and it is only the form of the language that varies in setting forth duties, warnings and promises: "Behold, the heaven, and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's thy God; the earth also, with all that therein is. Only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day. Circumcise, therefore, the foreskins of your heart and be no more stiff-necked. Break up your fallow-ground and sow not among thorns. Circumcise yourselves to the Lord and take away the foreskins of your heart." Upon repentance, the promise is, The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. If then, namely, when in captivity, their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept the punishment of their iniquity, then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember, and I will remember the land.

Circumcision, of itself, made the subject of it a Jew outwardly, and it entitled him to the use of all the external means of grace, and it secured to him all the temporal blessings of the Covenant,

just as profession now makes a man a member of the visible Church and entitles him to all the rights and privileges of the external organization, but it also had a signification far more important. It implied repentance. It was a seal of the righteousness of faith, and this is all any sacrament can be. He therefore is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God. More than this Baptism cannot be, nor can it be anything much different, for it saves us, not by the putting away of the filthiness of the flesh, but because it, the work of the Spirit signified by it, enables its subject to war a good warfare and to lay hold on eternal life.

With regard to the Passover and the Lord's Supper, the two important common elements are, on the one hand, the commemoration of two great deliverances, the one from temporal and the other from spiritual evils, the one typical of the other, and on the other hand, the idea of substitution, the first-born of Egypt in the place of Israel, and the Lord Jesus Christ in our place, bearing our sins, enduring their punishment and thus carrying them away. For Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us—in our place and in order to our deliverance; for without the shedding of blood there is no remission.

The visible Church, therefore, is one, because it is made visible by Sacraments expressive of the same essential truths of salvation: namely, assuming that all men, Jew and Gentile, are both sinful and guilty, they teach that sinfulness must be taken away immediately by repentance, efficiently by the Holy Ghost, and that guilt must be expiated by the death of a substitute. For our life is forfeited, and it must be redeemed with life. These truths symbolized are the very line which separates the Church from the world and makes it, in the nature of things, one body, not several.

Fourthly. The visible Church is one, for the reason that it is promised by covenant, the same blessing. Now the Lord had

said unto Abram, "Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee. And I will make thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing, and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall the families of the earth be blessed."

After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abram in a vision saying, Fear not, Abram, I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward. And behold, the word of the Lord came unto him saying, This shall not be thine heir, but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels, shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad and said, Look now toward heaven and tell the stars if thou be able to number them. And he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness, and confirmed the promise on the one hand, and the faith of Abram on the other, by a sacrifice.

Again, when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram and said unto him, I am the Almighty (Self-sufficient) God, walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make a covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face, and God talked with him saying, As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham, for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between thee and me, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, and all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou and thy seed after thee, in their

generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee. Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you."

In virtue of this covenant God remembered His people in Egypt, and brought them out with a high hand. He gave them the Sacrament of the Passover, in which redemption by purchase was the prominent idea, and at Mount Sinai formed them into a distinct nation, separated from all the nations of the earth by institutions pointing directly to a great High Priest, who would, by one offering, forever perfect them who are sanctified.

In all these different covenants, or different forms of the same covenant, temporal and spiritual blessings were intermingled. On the one hand, there was the promise of everlasting life by grace, through faith, as distinguished from the merit acquired by works, and on the other, the promise of divine protection throughout all their generations and the land of Canaan for their temporal inheritance, the principle and the promise being then as now—Godliness is profitable in all things, having the promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come.

From this peculiar condition of things, in which the Church and the State were one, the Church being a civil institution, and the State essentially religious, arose, in after ages, the great mistake of the covenant people. They failed to distinguish between temporal and spiritual blessings, holding that the possession of the one infallibly secured the other, thus making the same mistake sometimes made in our day, namely, that the visible and the invisible Church are commensurate, and therefore those who are in the visible Church are for that reason in the invisible also, and on the other hand, that those who are not in the visible Church are therefore excluded from the General Assembly and Church of the first-born that are written in heaven. This was a capital point between our Lord and His apostles, on the one hand, and the authorities of the Jewish Church on the

other, each party claiming to be in true succession from Abraham, and heirs according to the promise, and each party admitting that those who were not Abraham's seed, in the true intent and meaning of the words, were in schism, not against the organization, for in that both were formally included, but in schism against the general principles, and therefore separated from the peculiar blessings and privileges of Jehovah's Covenant, that is, the Jews of our Lord's time failed to perceive that the essential thing was not the external organization but the internal spirit, not the works of the flesh, but the fruits of the Spirit found in the individual members.

In explaining to the Gentiles the provisions of these Covenants, the Apostle Paul says: Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And unto seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the Covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law, which was four hundred and thirty years afterward cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise. From this position the inference is: If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise. To be of the seed of Abraham, therefore, and to belong to Christ—to be a child of Abraham, circumcised or uncircumcised, and to be a child of God, are one and the same thing.

To the same purpose the Apostle writes to the Romans: Cometh then this blessedness, namely, righteousness imputed by means of faith without works, upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for (in order to) righteousness. How then was it reckoned? When he was in circumcision or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith, which he had, yet being uncircumcised:

that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised.

The same truth in still another form is : Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us : for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree : that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

The specific effect, therefore, of the work of Christ in regard to this form of the Covenant is that the national peculiarities were stricken off, and the Covenant with Abraham is restored to the form in which it was first given in all its generality, namely, that in Abraham all the nations, or more radically still, all the families of the earth, should be blessed. These truths, therefore, the Jewish church held, not as a *peculium*, as they came to regard them, but to be preserved until the promised Seed should come ; and these same truths we now hold, not simply for our own benefit, but, in trust, in order to their dissemination among all the nations and families of the whole earth. The Christian Church, therefore, is not the successor of the Jewish, but identical with it. The yoke of bondage is stricken off, and the Covenant is thereby restored to all its original fullness of blessing and freeness of promise. Just those blessings, therefore, belong to the followers of Christ now that belonged to Abraham ; and to Abraham God said : I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee. In this Covenant the children were included. The doctrine, therefore, that the children of believers are visibly in the Covenant, is not a doctrine Jewish in its origin, nor was it a national peculiarity or prerogative ; but it is a part of that Gospel which was preached unto Abraham long before the Law was given, or Israel as a nation existed. In order, therefore, to a complete definition of the visible Church as it now exists, this element must be added. It consists, therefore, of all those throughout the whole world who profess the true religion, together with their children. This last provision does not, indeed, belong to the definition as an element

necessary to its existence, but it does belong to it as a gracious provision of its Divine constitution. For a Church can be, and has been, formed of those who have no children, and if all the children of any particular Church were cut off by disease or accident, the essential nature and existence of that Church would not be affected. Indeed, if all the officers of any particular Church were to perish in some great calamity, the Church itself would survive. Therefore, because the visible Church is the outward form of the life which is hid with Christ in God; because the terms of membership in it are everywhere and always the same, and the line which separates it from the world is the same sacraments; and also because the blessings promised to it are secured by the same Covenant,—for these reasons and to this extent, all the professed followers of the Lord Jesus Christ are one.

Fifthly. With regard to the external union of all existing Churches into one body, it is to be noted: 1st. That the real, essential unity of the Church, viewed as the outward expression of the life of Christ within it, is independent of any particular form of organization. It has existed without Sacraments, with one Sacrament and with two. It had one form, a family institution, during the patriarchal state; another, a national institution, co-ordinate with the State, during the Levitical dispensation; and still another entirely separated from the State in the cities and provinces of the Roman Empire, during the time embraced in the history contained in the New Testament, from the Day of Pentecost onward to the close of the canons of Scripture. In all these Churches there was only one flock, separated into many folds by reason of race, language, and the physical barriers of oceans, deserts and mountains; many, yet one and all equal, as shown by the fact that the Divine presence was in, and the Divine blessing rested on, and the Divine care was over all.

2d. It must be remembered that the object sought is the unity of the Church, and not uniformity in the Church, which are very different things; the one is precious, the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, the other worthless. For it can

bind together the Pharisee and the Sadducee. It spreads the ample folds of its garment over the Jesuit and the Jansenist equally and indifferently. It includes the Gallican and the Ultra-montanist; those who stand up for, and those who stand against the Apostolical succession and the grace-giving power of the Sacraments.

Such can observe the same ritual, say daily the same prayers, and yet be unbound by the bond of peace; but as the body without the spirit is dead, so uniformity without unity is dead also. It is worse than dead. It is life counterfeited by machinery, a mere automaton. On the other hand, those who profess Christ by making manifest the graces of the Spirit in their lives as individuals, and sacramentally as an organization, have by God's Covenant Abraham's reward, and transmit to their seed after them the same precious promises. All such, being many, are one body. They have all been made to drink into one Spirit. They may be as diverse as the colors in the bow of promise, but they are one as the elements of the clear white light. In form they are many and diverse, but in origin, nature and destiny they are one.

The manifested Presence, therefore, of the Holy Ghost, in every branch of the visible Church or in any particular congregation of believers, convincing of sin and giving peace to the troubled conscience through the blood of Jesus, this Seal of God, which can be neither counterfeited nor denied, designates a Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, the dwelling-place of God, and temple of the Holy Ghost, as the pillar of cloud and of fire designated the theocratic nation. That organization, therefore, whatever its form or history, to which this Divine Seal is attached, is in communion with God, the object of His love and care, whatever way it may be isolated from those who glory in uniformity and maintain it at the expense of real, living unity.

This unity of the Spirit, as far as it is made manifest, is so far an answer to the prayer of our Lord: Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through

their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, are in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory, which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. For the world is sharp-sighted enough to discern real unity in outward diversity, and real diversity in outward uniformity.

Sixthly. With regard to the practical work of reforming the actually existing churches into one, it is plain, 1st, That previous agreement as to the Rule of Faith and Duty is essential. For as long as there are differences of opinion as to what the Rule is, there can be no agreement as to what it teaches in regard either to what is essential, on the one hand, to the existence of a church, and on the other, to its well-being. From this it follows that, as the case now stands, all efforts to unite the Romish and Greek Churches on the one hand, and Protestant Churches on the other, into one Church are simply useless. They must fail, because there is no principle of union common to both parties. For a Church inspired of the Holy Ghost, and therefore infallible, can neither make proposals to nor receive proposals from those who hold that the Scriptures are the only and the infallible Rule. The very Rule of Faith and Duty, therefore, as held by each party, is an insuperable barrier to union between the parties. Indeed, until the question in regard to the authoritative Rule is settled, it remains in doubt, as between the parties, whether union is a duty binding on the professed followers of Christ, or in what form and on what terms union is even desirable.

2dly. There appears to be no sufficient reason wherefore some Churches now standing aloof from each other should not form a union, within certain limits, by treaty; each one, for example, obliging itself to keep away from a field already fully occupied by one of the others. This would show a real unity of purpose, of which the world could not but take notice, a

union that would prove that these churches, how much soever they may differ from each other, love Christ and regard the salvation of the lost more than they love and regard denomination or party; and also that they value their peculiarities less than they value the interests of Christ's kingdom. In order to such a union, only those truths symbolized in the Sacraments and those other truths admitted by common consent to be inseparably connected with them are necessary.

It is plain, also, that a union by treaty can, in the nature of things, exist only among such Churches as regard each other as equals; not between a Church and a Conventicle; that is, it cannot exist between those who assume that they are right, and therefore, that all who are separated from them are for that reason in schism, in rebellion against God. In such a state of things, there can be no other union than the union of submission. In order to a treaty-union among Churches that acknowledge each other as such, no one party can demand of the others or receive less, as a basis, than the truth symbolized in the Sacraments by which God has visibly separated His Church from the world. The Sacraments, therefore, of Circumcision and the Passover, of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, must be discussed as to their nature and benefits, until some good degree of unanimity in opinion is arrived at, before any real progress toward an external union worth having can be made. For if the Churches now organically separated are not drawn towards each other by a spontaneous impulse springing from the teachings of the Word and Spirit of God, their apparent unity will, in fact, be only such uniformity as will disprove, as far as it goes, the allegation the Father sent His Son to be the Saviour of the world. The union, therefore, whether in Christian fellowship, in purpose or organic, for which our Lord prayed, must be a growth nurtured by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, a growth unto Christ and, therefore, towards each other. Such a union, having such an origin and such an object, cannot but, in the end, lead to the unity of organization, the ideal of the Church in its earthly condition as a witness for Christ.

3dly. There appears no sufficient reason wherefore some churches should not proceed at once to consider and to form an organic union, namely, those churches, for example, which glory in calling themselves Presbyterian and Methodists. They agree among themselves respectively in regard both to their doctrinal standards and their views of Church government, and, therefore, it is not easy to understand why this real union in opinion should not express itself by unity in organization.

Seventhly. Heretofore it has assumed that the union for which our Lord prayed is an external union. But this is by no means necessarily true. For it is plain that the end, convincing the world of Christ's divine mission, can be secured by another kind of unity. There may be, for example, such a oneness of the truth held, of the purposes entertained, of the means used and of the spirit manifested as would secure the end, at least as far as we know anything to the contrary.

But if the union prayed for is organic, then of course there must be officers to administer its affairs; and then, as among Protestants, there can be in the united Church no officer not provided for in the Scriptures and proved by the Scriptures alone, not by the Scriptures supplemented by early Christian writers and fortified by the ancient Canons; and on the other hand, if it is safe to predict anything of the future by the study of the past, then it is as certain as any uncertain thing can be that the office of elder will be found in the reunited Church of the future. For, from the time of its introduction during that transition period in which the Church passed from its Patriarchal state into a National institution, it runs through the whole history of the Church as far as given in the Scriptures. It was an established and a well-known institution in Egypt; for Moses, although he bore a divine commission and was clothed with miraculous power to enforce compliance with his demands, was directed to take the elders with him when he went in to speak unto Pharaoh. From this time forward the elders are found in the Church everywhere and always until the close of its history as given in the Scriptures; in the Desert, during

the conquest, under the judges and under the kings, in Babylon and after Restoration ; and when the History contained in the New Testament opens, the elders appear again and take part in those last fearful acts by which the children of Abraham cut themselves off from the blessings of Jehovah's covenant. They were present when the Dispensation of the Covenant of Grace put on its present form on the day of Pentecost, and they continue in the Church until the inspired History closes. The office of elder, therefore, introduced into the Church before its organization was completed by the Sacrament of the Passover, is the only office that belongs to all the forms of organization in which it has pleased God to separate His own people from the world. It seems, therefore, as far as human foresight can go, as if this office will continue as long as the church has any organic existence on the earth ; and in Heaven, the Apostle John saw four and twenty elders distinguished both from the four living creatures and also from the great multitude of the redeemed. It seems, therefore, as if God, when He introduced the office of elder into His Church, intended it to be permanent.

VII.

THE CHURCH QUESTION PRACTICALLY CONSIDERED.

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, D.D.,
Lancaster, Pa.

As far back as the year 1844 Dr. D'Aubigne said that "the Church is every day becoming the greatest, the most exciting question." In the same year Dr. Schaff, shortly after his arrival in this country, carrying with him as he did the latest and the best results of the Evangelical theology of Germany, informed us very emphatically that "the main question of *our* time is concerning the nature of the Church in its relation to the world and to single Christians." In his inaugural address, the Principle of Protestantism, he made an able and earnest contribution towards its solution. Subsequently it was discussed extensively, earnestly, and perhaps more profoundly, in this REVIEW than in any other periodical in the country.

We do not ourselves regard the question, in itself considered, as the greatest or the most important in our times. It is, however, a part, and essentially so, of a still more comprehensive and vital question, which has been such in all ages, and is especially primary in the nineteenth century. What do ye think of Christ? precedes and includes the other, What do ye think of the Church? The two are inseparable. Christ without His Church is an abstraction: the Church without Christ as its head is a mass of corrupt humanity, which must sooner or later disintegrate on account of its own inherent weakness.

In our day Christianity has been assaulted at all of what are regarded as its vulnerable points, and the enemy, under the imagination that he has captured the outposts, the Church, its

creeds and its theologies, tries now to rush into the inmost sanctuary of the Christian faith, and attempts to attack Christ Himself on His throne of glory. It is on some accounts no doubt well that it is so, because it is here that the great and decisive battle is to be fought. Let it go on. Believers have no cause to fear as it regards the result.

Victory at this point, bringing out into broad daylight correct views of the person and the glory of Christ, must necessarily throw the ranks of the enemy into confusion and dismay. At the same time it strengthens all other points of defence on the outskirts and frontiers of the Christian empire. In proportion as He is acknowledged and felt to be the head or central person of the Church, it must grow more and more into His likeness; and with the light streaming from His person, the building must rise, assume the proportions, the symmetry, the grandeur and beauty of its heavenly ideal or plan. Human builders and master-builders, pervaded with the life and spirit of the Great Architect, will continue the work in storm and sunshine until the dome is completed, and the capstone is laid amidst shouting and rejoicing. It is in this way, as we conceive, that the great Church Question is to be answered. In this connection it is vital and all important.

Hitherto, as discussed in this periodical, the subject has, to a great extent, been a matter of speculation, and most of the articles have been of a theoretical character, all of which is right and proper in its place. But this method has its disadvantages, its drawbacks, as well as its advantages. It often leads to misapprehension or misconception, and different persons, occupying different standpoints of thought or feeling, may receive very divergent impressions of what the theory is actually intended to inculcate. It is a difficulty that inheres in all philosophy. A system springs up, proceeding perhaps from an honest belief in Christianity; but sooner or later it is made to teach skepticism or infidelity. What would Mr. Locke say of the use which Mr. Hume made of his philosophy, if he were to appear again on the sea of speculation?

At the present time the Church Question comes up, to some of our readers at least, not as a theory, but as something practical. It is proposed that the two Reformed Churches of German and Dutch origin in this country should unite, or at least come into some closer union. The subject has met with favor, and, as we understand, measures of some kind have been adopted to bring about the contemplated union of the churches. It looks towards the unification of two religious bodies, which have always been regarded as closely related, as nearly kin to each other,—in fact, next kinsmen.

The problem now, as we have said, is a practical one, and it is right that it should be discussed in its practical bearings. It, however, involves fundamentally profound principles; and, as it looks not only to a greater union of two, but, in the end, of all Evangelical denominations, and derives much of its force from the prospect of such a general unification, it seems proper that the general no less than the particular question should be considered—the one in the light of the other, which can be done in a practical way, just as it should be.

All church union, as it seems to us, should in some sense of the term be *organic*,—that is, the bodies united should have a common life, so that they may unfold their strength from within and not from without. This evidently is the meaning of the Saviour's prayer that His disciples might all be one, even as He and the Father are one. Anything short of this would be simply an aggregation, a league, an alliance or confederation, brought together for some temporary purpose, prompted mainly, it may be, by the prospect of some mutual advantages that may be realized by the proposed closer union or concert of action, ending, probably, in the absorption or disintegration of some of its members. Such unions are no truthful unions at all; they are only diversity, which lack the principle or informing spirit that is to bring about unity. Generally, as experience goes to show, they do not last long. They resemble somewhat the leagues or alliances of the old Scottish clans, which sometimes, under a special impulse, were wont to flow together

all of a sudden, so as to form a mighty mountain torrent; but, as Lord Macaulay says, they did not hold together long enough to accomplish any very important or prominent results. Each tribe had its centre in itself, without any more general centre beyond itself. In this country, for some time after the Revolution, the thirteen colonies, which had all been declared sovereign States by the mother country, formed at first a Confederation, which was a loose kind of union, for mutual advantage and defence; but the wisest and best men of the day, who had a clear conception of what the situation required, pronounced it a mere "rope of sand."

About forty years ago two very respectable denominations, whose names we need not here mention, formed one of these external unions, which it was thought would be attended with useful results in the future. A mutual kind feeling had pervaded both bodies during all their previous intercourse, and they were in most respects closely allied in their history and denominational life. Many persons thought well of it, and predicted that it would end in a happy marriage or organic unity. But it did not work well nor last long. The two sides had scarcely come together so as to form each other's more intimate acquaintance, before they flew apart with an intense rebound, and for a time interrupted the pleasant harmony which had existed for a long time previously. The reaction went so far as to make the fraternal interchange of corresponding delegates rather embarrassing for a number of years, until the one body put on its records serious charges against the other of having departed from the faith once delivered to the saints. In reply the other body expressed itself in rather plain language, and asserted that the record made by the sister church was not "in accordance with the actual facts." After the dust and smoke of this collision between the brethren on the Hudson and those on the Susquehanna had passed away, they began to love each other again as in the days of yore, and, as it seems, the feeling has been growing stronger during later

years. The union here attempted was too abstract. It lacked in an organizing, centralizing, principle.

In the next place, church union should be so far catholic, fundamental and comprehensive as to take in all truly evangelical churches, if they desire it. If two or three of them, more closely allied to each than to others on the outside, should form a union just for themselves, they might diminish the number of denominations, or of sects, as some persons would say, but that would not destroy the principle of sectism or division: it would rather intensify it. Thus it might appear, if all kinds of Baptists should coalesce and form one Baptist body; and if, moreover, all the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians and the Lutherans should forget their divisions and unite among themselves, so as to form one united body of their own, without any reference to the rest of the saints, that this would constitute a vast stride towards Protestant unity. But such an expectation may be fairly questioned and honestly challenged. It would involve an intensification of the Lutheran, the Episcopal, the Methodist, the Congregationalistic, the Baptist and the Presbyterian principles, and the difficulty might then be greater than it was before. We should have large and imposing church bodies, and as each would have strong faith in itself and be able to exert a still wider influence, taking human frailty into consideration, they might easily be led to have less love and charity for each other than they have now when they are weaker, and are not in a condition to assert themselves as distinctively, not as much so, as they might be tempted to do, if all their resources were at their command.

It is not necessary for us here to disparage any of the fundamental, underlying, denominational principles just referred to. We may freely admit that they are all relatively right, and that they are not necessarily antagonistic to each other. They assume this character only when they are strained and maintained in an exclusive and one-sided way. They have all served as organizing powers in the growth and prosperity of individual denominations, and as the fruit has been good we

must admit they cannot necessarily be contradictory to Scripture or the Spirit of Christ. In other words, we say they are all good in their place, and in the connections in which they took their rise.

These principles, however, all lose their character of truthfulness when they are brought forward as the foundation on which the one true, Catholic, Evangelical Church is to be built. Then they become sectarian in the true sense of the term—impregnated with the spirit of sect, which is directly opposed to the spirit of the Gospel.

Over against this splicing together of what might be regarded as fragments of the great Protestant commonwealth, we plead for a principle that will embrace them all, impart to them unity of life, and prepare them to grow together in an organic unity, so as to strengthen the whole, and with it all the members. This is something that is just the converse of the fragmentary unions just referred to, which strengthen the parts and weaken the whole.

This principle of organic unity for Protestantism must, as we look at it, be sought in history, and to find it we must go back to its origin, when the general movement started out and then began to advance in two streams, running in parallel, or, at times, it may be, in opposite directions. This division of one Evangelical church into two branches, the Lutheran and Reformed, both involved at first as germs in the Augsburg Confession, was by no means an unmitigated evil. It was, as it seems, a necessity of history, and the interests of truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, required it. Nationality and language came in and helped to separate not only the Lutherans from the Reformed, but Reformed from Reformed,—the Swiss, the German, the Dutch, the French, the Scotch, the Irish, and other branches of the Reformed family of churches. These divisions have in many ways been overruled for good, and it may be confidently affirmed that by means of all these branch churches we have a much better and more complete expression of Evangelical Christianity than if they had been of one type, and had borne the

same superscription. If that had been German, Anglican or Scotch exclusively, we most likely would have the same trouble as we now have with Latin Christianity. The division into two, and then into various sub-divisions preserved the liberty and freedom of the Church, whilst at the same time it did in fact advance the cause of Catholic truth.

But if this be admitted, so far as the past is concerned, it is not so easy to regard it as the normal state of things for the wide expanding future, and especially in a country such as ours. Our life, political, social and religious, is becoming more and more one,—that is, American,—and we are gradually losing the types of Christian life which our forefathers brought with them from Europe, without surrendering their substance or the good which is permanent in them all. For the last three hundred years the tendency towards separation has been very strong, perhaps predominant, and the time has arrived when the other tendency should be emphasized, and be allowed to have free course, so as to be glorified. And this return to unity should, as we think, commence just at the point where the division took place in the beginning between the Lutheran and Reformed households of faith.

The union of the two original branches of the Reformation was effected in Germany as far back as the year 1817. It may have been to some extent prompted by political considerations, and possibly outward worldly power may have been used to bring it about, but the inner facts in the case are sufficient to show that it was due largely to the piety of the King of Prussia and of the people over whom he ruled. Germany had been humbled, brought down into the dust, during the Napoleonic wars, and it was felt that the nation should arise out of the dust, shake off its worldliness and unbelief, and seek to serve God more faithfully in the future. The union of the two confessions was the result of this longing for a higher union with Christ and a greater degree of fidelity in His service. It was resisted both on the Lutheran and Reformed side, as is the case still, but no one can deny that it has accomplished a good work

in reviving a broader and more Evangelical faith, and that the union has come to be an historical fact of wide reaching and permanent value.

The precedent established in the Fatherland made a deep impression on the daughter churches in this country, and from the year 1517 onwards, various and earnest efforts were made from time to time to bring about a union here also. They failed at the time for reasons which it is not necessary for us here to specify in detail; but it is proper to say that they carried with them the sympathies, the intelligence and support of the best men in both denominations. But failures in the past in any truly good work do not imply that further efforts are idle and nugatory. The question, therefore, arises at this time, when the air is full of ideas of a more extended Protestant unity, whether it would not be well to consider at least the question of a union between Lutheran and Reformed brethren on this side of the ocean, similar to that which has existed for a long time between them on the other side.

Of course much could be said against the very mention of such a thought as a union of the Lutherans and Reformed; and it would not require much knowledge of Church history to bring up a long list of their strifes and conflicts. Volumes would not contain the long array of their *Streitigkeiten*. The Reformed, as he might imagine, could file many true bills against the Lutherans, and the Lutherans, on the other side, most likely could bring in counter-charges against the Reformed, which would balance, if they did not entirely swamp, their charges. But admitting all these things as a part of the dead past, over which we may now weep or smile according to the mode of mind in which we may find ourselves, still we maintain, however paradoxical it may seem to some, that there has always been a warm affection between the Lutherans and Reformed. Friction and strife at times between sisters does not necessarily rule out an underlying warm affection between them, and much less can it be so between two sister churches, which are built upon the same historical foundation. As Dr.

Rauch wrote in one of his essays, it was just because these two bodies had so many points of unity that they came so often into contact. Had there been fewer, or none at all, the probability is that the collisions would have been fewer, and certainly less irritating. In the same article the Doctor went on to speak from his own observation of the effect upon the people when the union between the two bodies took place in his own native country of Hessa, as an occasion of general rejoicing in the congregations on both sides, and a general outbreak of love and affection among the members.

Every subject, according to a trite remark, has two sides, and so it is with this aspect of the question before us. If it can be said of the Lutherans and Reformed that in some instances they fought each other rather fiercely, it can nevertheless be said of them in many more instances, How they loved each other. In Eastern Pennsylvania from the beginning they worshiped together generally in peace in the same church buildings, and in some instances where one denomination owned the property it gave the other equal legal rights in it, so that there might be two pastors instead of one.

Not many years ago the Reformed Church (German) had in some measure lost caste with its sister Reformed Churches, and it looked as if there were something like a concerted movement to compel her to come to their terms or to bring on a general disintegration of her membership. But during that period of anxiety the Lutherans took no part in what was perhaps too sarcastically called the "crusa'e" against us. In those rather dark, tempestuous days, the Lutherans were our best friends both publicly and privately.

But some will say that it is all a romance to suppose that the Lutherans and Reformed can ever be brought together. It may be so for the present decade, but it may not be so for the succeeding decades of years yet to come. The subject, therefore, is worthy of consideration and prayerful study. In altered circumstances, when the necessity for the unity of the churches is more urgent, and when better ideas of the nature of that

unity have come to prevail, the failures of the past may only be the stepping-stones to success in the future.

It may be, and it may not be, a question whether the union proposed would meet with favor in that wing of the Lutheran Church which lays the most stress on its confessions. We are not in a condition to know in what light it would regard such a proposition, whether in one way or the other. The subject, if brought up, would no doubt receive earnest and profound attention. There would, however, probably be less difficulty, as it seems to us, in the other wing, which is represented by the General Synod, in which the Melancthonian tendency prevails probably to a larger extent than elsewhere. As Calvin and Melancthon could shake hands, and agree substantially in their doctrines of the Lord's Supper, so here their disciples in this western world might do the same thing, and rising above mere names, inaugurate a movement towards catholic unity for which the ages to come would bless and thank them.

Some thirty or more years ago a distinguished Reformed theologian expressed some surprise that more account was not made of the Lutheran Church in this country. It was then regarded as a mere individual denomination among others like it. The same view to a large extent prevails among Reformed churches still, but as the same writer then observed, Lutheranism properly represents an entire hemisphere of the Protestant faith, whilst all other Protestant denominations stand over against it simply as the other hemisphere. Since Dr. Nevin made this declaration the Lutheran Church in this country has made wonderful strides in the number of its membership. It is numerically now one of our largest Protestant denominations, and by its rapid increase annually from emigration, it may not be many years before it becomes the strongest in its list of members.

Most manifestly such a large body of Evangelical Christians cannot, or at least should not, be overlooked in the organization of the future Evangelical Church of America. At the same time it is difficult to see how it can itself be insensible or indif-

ferent to the claims which our common Evangelical Christianity has upon it to promote the unity of Christ's body, the Church, in this land of ours where, among many Reformed Churches, it has taken root, and promises to flourish like the palm planted by the river of water. In a work of this kind we believe the Lutherans would be just as prompt and helpful as any of the Reformed.

The point of connection between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches generally is our own, the German Reformed Church; more so, as it seems to us, than is the case with any other denomination, such, for instance, as the Congregationalists or Methodists. History, nationality, doctrine, church life or, as we may say, Providence, has made it such, and, if so, who is there then to gainsay it?

As Reformed, in our efforts to promote the true and lasting unity, let us not inconsiderately tear ourselves away from our Lutheran brethren. It will only tend to widen the breach that already exists, and deprive us of one of the most potent elements in all Catholic, Evangelical, Christian unity. To overlook the Lutheran element in our efforts to bring about the true unity of the Church, is to count without the host.

A mere union of the two Reformed Churches in this, German and Dutch, would not, as it seems to us, accomplish any special, permanent results. Let, however, these two churches, with say the Reformed Episcopal branch, or perhaps some others, come together and unite with a part or the whole of the Lutheran Church, then there would be a good beginning, at least, of what would grow and take in other denominations in the end, until we all come to the unity of the faith in the bond of perfectness. It would involve a unity which, in the nature of the case, cannot exist without diversity, and even to some extent without antagonisms, that would rather give strength and awaken vitality in the entire union. The doctrinal basis, so far as doctrine should come in at all as a basis, would be a consensus of the faith of the two confessions, which would, as a matter of course, rest on the Augsburg Confession and the Heidelberg

Catechism, which are the oldest, the most œcumenical and Catholic of all the Protestant confessions. Holland, Switzerland and Germany were the original seats of the Protestant Reformation, and if the churches of those countries here in this land, where they are losing more and more of their original nationalities and are becoming broader, because they are more American, could form a union or Church-Diet, a vast stride towards the unification of all the Churches would be made. It might appear insignificant or unpromising at first, and perhaps not arrest any considerable attention, but that would only be so much the better. The germ thus planted in the right kind of soil might have more freedom to grow into a wide-spreading oak or to a lofty cedar of Lebanon.

Such a union as this must not be manufactured—*gekuenstelt*—in which the parts are to be placed in the hands of ecclesiastical architects to be pruned and reduced to such shape and form that each one may be put into its place so as to fit. That might show mechanical skill, but the result would be a mechanism, not an organism. Churches are living things; they have a thousand springs, like human bodies, and as such they must be treated; or else all attempts at healing their diseases or of promoting their health will be nothing better than ecclesiastical quackery.

The Evangelical denominations of this country are free, sovereign and independent bodies, and as such they must enter into ecclesiastical union with one another. They must come with their creeds, their doctrines, their cultus, their customs and animating spirit; with their strength and their weaknesses, just as they are, and when once they get into the union they must be allowed to retain their freedom and sovereignty within their own spheres, just as they did before. In the course of time each one would conform to a higher animating principle of unity.

But would there be any unity among these wrangling sects, as the cynic would say? That depends altogether on what we mean by unity. It would not be such a unity, amounting to

uniformity, such as we witness in the Roman Catholic Church, which makes room for only one type of Christianity—and that not the best—to the exclusion of all others, some of which at least, we may hope, are better than it is itself. All true unity requires and implies diversity, and the more of the latter, when it is bound together by one spirit, the better.

As in other things, so here we may learn from the world what constitutes a true union; and it is not necessary that we should go far back into the past, or pass over to the old world to find it. We have it here in our own land, before our own doors, in our political framework, of which we are living members, as all would admit. Our original thirteen colonies were declared by the mother country to be free, sovereign and independent States. They, however, wisely formed a union, and without sacrificing their freedom or their own proper sovereignty they became a nation; that is, one people. With the nature and strength of this union we are familiar. In all past history we have not such an illustration of political union, where the freedom and diversity of the parts are so largely respected and asserted.

With such an example of worldly wisdom before us, there ought to be no difficulty in arriving at a practical solution of church union. In all ages the form of church government and regimen has been taken largely from the political institutions of the times. Rothe shows this very satisfactorily in his *Anfänge der christlichen Kirche*. When the State is monarchical in form, the Church becomes from the pressure in the case monarchical also—*pari passu*; when the former assumes the republican form, the latter must become republican, also—*quoad hoc*. If there had been no Emperors at Rome, Constantinople or in Germany in the olden times, most probably there would have been neither Popes nor Patriarchs. The one was an apparent necessity involved in the other. But as times change men also change. Old forms of the State, which is a divine idea, as well as the Church, pass away, because useless and obsolete; and therefore it is rational to infer that in a republican country

like ours, if we are to have any true Evangelical Church, its form must be republican also.

But if all denominations are to remain just as they are, without amending one jot or tittle of what they believe to be good and true, what would be the use of a Church-Diet or Congress and what would be its functions? The reply is, that if it were once formed, composed of delegates duly appointed to represent their constituencies, it would most probably find something to do, and not long before it would find its hands full of business. Harmony and peace might be promoted among the integral parts of the body; but like a well-organized army, it should not only serve as a defense to the churches, but feel that it ought to be usefully employed in offensive war against the common enemy, unbelief, infidelity, social corruption, and the insidious forms of error, which threaten, like an army of locusts to come in upon the Church and eat up every green thing.

The weakness of the Evangelical Church in this country, as well as in the world at large, consists in its divisions, or rather in the want of a central organizing power, which shall develop itself into an external unity, that shall enable it to act in concert and to concentrate its entire strength. Without this it cannot resist, as it should, the claims of the Romish hierarchy. That is growing both outwardly and inwardly in this country, including in it the monarchical principles in the Church; and unless it is confronted with something better in Protestant unity, it may, and it probably will, be the ruling power in the very territory which by original right belongs to the Evangelical faith.

What has been said, largely as incentives to lead others to think and reflect on a momentous subject, is mostly of a general character; but, as already said, it is intended to have its application to a particular case of church union; or, rather, to the inauguration of a great and good work in an humble beginning among the descendants of the original churches of the Reformation. Can it be accomplished? We do not know, but we think it can. What would the Dutch Reformed say to a union with the Lutherans, or the Lutherans to a union with that branch of the Reformed Church? We do not know, but we be-

lieve that it is something worthy of their grave consideration. And then what would the Episcopalians say to sit in a Church Diet with non-Episcopal Reformed? And what also would the German Reformed have to say to taking counsel and walking together to the sanctuary with the Episcopal brethren? We do not know, neither are we in a condition to answer such questions. We are here simply making suggestions. But at the same time we believe with all our hearts, that, if a beginning—a real beginning—could be made in the unification of our evangelical denominations, a new era would open before us in the progress of the Kingdom of God among our people, in which all alike would rejoice—and be ready to participate.

We are well aware that we have exposed ourselves to the charge of egotism when we suggest that practical, concrete church unity should commence with the Lutherans and Reformed, with the Augsburg Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. Nor are we ignorant of the fact that we are surrounded by other and more influential denominations; we are quite willing to give them credit for the great work that they are doing for the cause of Christ and the spread of the Gospel; and we mean no reflection upon them when we do not mention them in the origination of organic unity in our churches. We know that they would be in sympathy with an earnest movement of this kind. It is our suggestion that it should most properly begin with the Lutherans and Reformed, because with them the division commenced. That is something for us to consider.

If, however, the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, or the Methodists and Episcopalians, could come together and form a union that would embrace all other evangelical denominations in its scope, in the way which has been proposed, then we say, for our part, that all true Christians should bid them God-speed and give them their cordial support. It is not likely that Lutherans and Reformed would lag far behind them or object to their leadership, always provided they make sufficient room for us, just as we are, in the new commonwealth of Israel in which all should have a part.

As it regards the practical solution of the great Church Ques-

tion, the German Reformed body occupies a somewhat peculiar and unique position, somewhere intermediate between the Lutherans and Presbyterians. In its early history in this country, at one time we were strongly drawn towards the Dutch Reformed, at another towards the Lutherans, and the result was that, being in a strait, we could not unite either with the one or the other. We remained just where we were, friendly to both. There was, perhaps, as we may now believe, something providential in this command "to stand still." It may have been so ordered, that we might thus come to a better situation to see the salvation of the Lord in the future.

The recent proposition that the two Reformed Churches in this country, Dutch and German, should form some more intimate union, involves to some extent the severance of the latter from their Lutheran brethren, and, therefore, some degree of violence to history and its associations. Once, on a public occasion, Dr. Nevin, replying to some Presbyterian delegates, who came to present the kind wishes and Christian sympathies of their own Church to their Reformed brethren, assured them that the sympathy was reciprocated, and that it would always continue, without, however, allowing it to interfere with intimate historical relations which connected the Reformed and Lutherans together. In such a reply as this, as it seems to us, is to be found the proper response to the proposition of a closer union between the German and Dutch Reformed Churches at the present time. If the Reformed in the Delaware, the Susquehanna and the Potomac are to unite with the Reformed in the Hudson and the Mohawk, then, as it seems to us, they should be allowed to bring their Lutheran cousins with them to the feast of charity and brotherly love. And so, on the other hand, if our Lutheran brethren were invited to unite with another denomination of honored ancestry, possessing wealth, culture, intelligence, influence and respectability in the cities, and besides, consisting of good Christians, active in every good work, then it seems to us they would not consent to such a union unless they could bring their country cousins, the Reformed, along with them into such Christian fellowship.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY. *The Prediction of the Fulfillment of Redemption Through the Messiah.* By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. Pp. xx., 519. Price \$2.50.

Messianic Prophecy is the crown and glory of Old Testament literature. To the Christian believer no theme can well be of more absorbing interest or of greater importance. It has been discussed in all ages of the Church; it has called forth a large variety of opinions; it has created an extensive literature; it has been handled from different points of view and applied to different ends. Its treatment has generally been apologetical or polemical, making prophecy serve either "as a word with which to smite the Jew or the infidel, or else as a crutch for a feeble faith in Christ and Christianity." But, apart from any practical purposes a discussion of the subject may subserve, Messianic prophecy has an interest and value of its own, as a unique and marvellous phenomenon which ought to arrest the attention even of the unbelieving scholar.

Whoever casts fresh light on the pages of the prophets by giving us a clearer knowledge of the meaning of their predictions, or by showing more adequately their historical fulfillment, deserves the sincere thanks of the Church; and because we believe that Dr. Briggs in his latest work has done this, we make our grateful acknowledgments to him, and give his book a cordial welcome.

Few American scholars, if indeed any, are better qualified than the author for the task to which he has addressed himself. On the one hand, his firm faith in Divine revelation and his reverent attitude toward the Bible which contains that revelation; and on the other, his general scholarship, his intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew language, his long study of the Old Testament Scriptures, and, we may add, his freedom from the trammels of a blind traditionalism, eminently fit him for a thorough and comprehensive treatment of the subject in all its bearings.

The author has planned his work on an extensive scale. The present volume is only the first of a series of three, intended to cover the whole ground of Messianic prophecy. It will be followed by a second volume, whose purpose will be to show how far the Messianic ideal portrayed by the Old Testament prophets has been fulfilled by the first advent of the Messiah, and how far it remained unfulfilled, was taken up into New Testament prophecy, and carried on to a higher stage of development. A third volume will trace the history of the Messianic ideal in the Christian Church, and show its importance in the development of Christian doctrine.

It is the purpose of the author, then, in this book, to exhibit Messianic prophecy as a system by itself and for itself, apart from its fulfillment. Hebrew prophecy culminates in Messianic prophecy, which is the prediction not simply of the personal Messiah, but of all that relates to the fulfillment of redemption through the Messiah. It is an organism comprising various members, which must be considered in their right proportions and inter-relations. It must be studied as a whole in its unity and variety, and in the several stages of its development. No single prediction can be fully understood apart from the system in which it stands. Each sets forth one phase of Messianic truth, which must be combined with all the other phases as they come to view in the historical development of prophecy. We must first study each prediction by itself in all its details, and then we must trace its organic relation to all the other predictions; and not until this is done are we prepared to study the fulfillment of Messianic prophecy in Christ and His redemption.

This is the course pursued by Dr. Briggs, who justly says:

"There is no section of Biblical doctrine which has been so little understood and so much abused as Messianic prophecy. The scholastics have interpreted the Messianic passages in accordance with the Christian doctrine of the person and work of Christ, from the point of view of a logical system of theology derived from the Bible, and they have ignored the organic system of Messianic prophecy in the Bible itself. They have overlooked the stages of development of the Messianic idea. They have neglected its varied phases. They have seen neither the unity nor the variety of the organism. They have sought above all things an Old Testament Christology. On the other hand, rationalists have ignored the ideal

element, and, in limiting the Messianic prediction to the local, temporal and circumstantial elements, determined the substance of the prediction by its external form, seeking in every way to exclude references to the Messiah, and the redemption brought to the world through Him. If predictive prophecy in general can be interpreted only by finding the key, much more is this the case with Messianic prophecy, the culmination of predictive prophecy. For this we need the Master's key—that will unlock the mysteries of each prediction, and pass us through the entire system of predictions. We hesitate not, therefore, to state that the key of Old Testament prophecy is the first advent of the Messiah, which unlocks a large number of its chambers. But the key of the entire system will not be given until the second advent. But this does not justify us in forcing New Testament meaning into Old Testament passages. If the Messiah gives us the key, He does not transform the predictions into histories. It is still necessary for us to see the connection between the Messiah as the central object of the prediction, and the mind of the predicting prophet, and the stage of redemption present to his experience. There is but one legitimate method for the interpretation of Messianic prophecy, and that is, (1) to study each prediction by itself with the most patient criticism and painstaking exegesis in all the details; (2) to study it in relation to other predictions in the series, and note the organic connection; (3) to study it in relation to Christ and His redemption. Such a method will discern that Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament is an organic whole—an advancing organism culminating in the Christ of the incarnation, of the cross and of the throne."

We have given this long extract because it sounds the keynote of the whole book. The author rightly lays stress on the historical side of Messianic prophecy. He sees in it a development in which the ideal of complete redemption through the Messiah attains to ever richer and fuller expression, advancing from lower to higher forms, from general to specific prediction—the several prophecies forming an organism in which each mutually supplements the others—the whole presenting, in terms of the Old Testament, an ideal which is perfectly realized in Christ and His redemption. And the first aim of the interpreter, therefore, must be to ascertain, by a strict grammatical and logical exegesis, the original historical

meaning of each prediction, this is, what the prophet meant, and what he intended his hearers to understand; so that, combining these several predictions into a whole, he may have a complete picture of the Messiah as foreseen by the Old Testament prophets, in order to compare it with the New Testament fulfillment.

At the same time, the author emphasizes still more strongly, if possible, the divine, supernatural and ideal features of prophecy. For it is not necessary to degrade the Hebrew seers as men in order to exalt the divine influence that employed them. Say, if you please, that they were men of extraordinary genius—patriots and statesmen, who had a wide acquaintance with the political and religious affairs of neighboring nations—above all, pious men, whose religious experience was intense, and whose ethical character was exalted; yet when all this and much more has been said, it still remains that Hebrew predictive prophecy, though it arises in accordance with psychological law, so transcends the normal power of the human soul, that we are constrained to think of the divine mind as its source and inspiration, especially when we consider that the prophets were linked in a chain, and that their predictions constitute “an organic whole which no individual prophet could comprehend, which now stands before the scholarly world in marvelous unity and variety as the object of the study of the ages of the past, which absorbs the energies of the present, and which arches the future even to the end of the world.”

Prophecy, according to Dr. Briggs, is both natural and supernatural, human and divine, historical and ideal. From its very nature, prediction must present the future in the forms of the present and the past—forms which are not real and literal representations of the future, but ideal and symbolical. It is necessary to distinguish between the substance and the form of prophecy. The form of prophecy, even in its highest stage, has a symbolical character, as is apparent from the use of sacred numbers. “Prophecies are predictions only as to the essential and the ideal elements. The purely formal elements belong to the point of view and coloring of the individual prophets. We are not to find exact and literal fulfillment in detail or in general; but the fulfillment is limited, as the prediction is limited, to the essential ideal contents of the prophecy.

* * * Looking forth into the future, prophetic prediction clothes

and represents that which is to come in the scenery and language familiar to it in the present and in the past."

These, in meagre outline, are some of the features of Messianic prophecy as presented by Dr. Briggs. There can be no question that, in the main, his view is correct. It avoids the errors both of an abstract supernaturalism and of a false naturalism. It does justice at once to the human and to the divine aspect of prophecy. There are, indeed, here and there, particular statements to which we must take exception; but, regarded as a whole, his conception will approve itself as satisfactory to all who, unblinded by dogmatic prejudice, have given themselves earnestly to the study of the prophetic writings.

Since predictive prophecy undergoes a development, it is necessary to a right apprehension of it that this development be traced out to its full extent. This is possible only if we succeed in arranging the various predictions in the order of their historical origin. We need not say that this is a most difficult task, from which, however, the author does not shrink, though it brings him face to face with some of the most delicate questions of the higher criticism,—the composite character of the Pentateuch, the exilic origin of *Is. xl.-lxvi.*, the denial of Zechariah's authorship of *Zech. ix.-xiv.*, the date of the composition of the book of Daniel. In reference to these and other critical questions, he occupies a free position, and does not hesitate frankly to set forth his convictions. In this he runs counter to the traditional opinions generally entertained in this country, though it must be said that he is supported by nearly all the critics who are regarded as authorities in Biblical science.

In Textual Criticism the author is equally free. He not unfrequently amends the Massoretic text from the ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, and where, in case of a manifest corruption, the external evidence is unsatisfactory, he resorts at times to critical conjecture. Some of the emendations he has adopted have long been approved by scholars; others are of a doubtful character, and will hardly meet with much favor. His textual work, however, is always worthy of careful consideration, though, as he remarks: "These results will not please those who esteem the Massoretic text as well-nigh infallible. We have no hope of overcoming the prejudices of such scholars. We have done our work for those who have

faith in the principles and methods of the Science of Biblical Criticism."

The arrangement of the book is in accordance with the historical development of prophecy. After presenting in two introductory chapters his view of Hebrew Prophecy and of Predictive Prophecy, he discusses in thirteen chapters (1) Primitive Messianic Ideas; (2) Messianic Prophecy in the Mosaic Age; (3) The Messianic Idea of the Davidic Period; (4) of the Earlier Prophets; (5) of Isaiah and his contemporaries; (6) of Jeremiah and his contemporaries; (7) of Ezekiel; (8) of the Exile; (9) The Prophecy of the Servant of Jehovah; (10) The Prophecy of the Restoration of Zion; (11) of Daniel; (12) The Messianic Idea of the Times of the Restoration; and (13) The Messianic Ideal. The various prophecies grouped under these several heads are given, with a very few exceptions where they were of too great length, in a new English translation made from the original text, with great care and with free use of the Revised Version. Many of these renderings are more faithful to the Hebrew than those of the Authorized and Revised Versions, though not so suitable for a version designed for popular use.

It is his interpretations, however, of the Messianic predictions that will be scanned most narrowly. Dr Briggs shows himself in this work a good exegete, and yet many of his explanations do not accord with those prevalent in English-speaking circles. Many of his readers, as he himself observes, will be surprised to find so little reference to the fulfilment of the prophecies. It must be borne in mind, however, that in this volume he only proposes to give the Messianic predictions in their original, primary, historical sense, postponing to a second volume the task of showing how far the Messianic ideal of the Old Testament, of which at the close of the book he gives an outline sketch, has been realized in Christ and Christianity, and what still remains to be fulfilled. Of the author's exegetical method we heartily approve, while in the application of the method we often reach different results. No two scholars, though guided by the same leading principles, will come to an agreement at all points. However, conclusions reached by so able a scholar as Dr. Briggs, after long, critical and historical study of the original text, are always worthy of a respectful hearing.

The book is an honor to the Biblical scholarship of America. It is clearly if not always gracefully written, fresh and original in

thought, rich in its suggestions, and stimulative of inquiry. It will command wide attention among scholars, and add much to the already great reputation of its author.

AN ARABIC MANUAL. By J. G. Lansing, D.D. Chicago. American Publication Society of Hebrew. 1886. Pp. 194. Price, \$2.00.

The publication of this Arabic grammar in this country—the first, we believe, ever published on the Western Continent—confirms us in an opinion we have entertained for some years with growing conviction, viz., that at no distant day the centre of Semitic studies will be transferred from Germany to America. A surprising interest in these studies has been awakened in our midst within the last five years. Hebrew receives more attention than formerly in our theological seminaries, and in many of them the cognate Semitic languages have been introduced, at least as optionals. These languages have even found a place in the curriculum of some of our colleges and universities. The schools of the Institute of Hebrew have met with remarkable success. During the present month of January a special course in Assyriology, free to all who choose to attend, will be given at Baltimore by the celebrated Professor Paul Haupt, one of the ablest Assyriologists living, formerly professor at Göttingen, Germany, now at Johns Hopkins University. During this same month the students of the Baptist Seminary at Morgan Park, Ill., will devote their time almost exclusively to Old Testament studies, when Dr. Harper will deliver five courses, of twenty lectures each, on Hebrew syntax and other subjects connected with the language and literature of the Old Testament. In addition to all this, let it be remembered that there are published in this country two able journals, *The Old Testament Student*, a monthly, and *Hebraica*, a quarterly, wholly devoted to Old Testament science, and that the American Publication Society of Hebrew has issued some of the best manuals of the Semitic languages, all by American scholars, viz., Harper's *Elements of Hebrew*, and *Introductory Hebrew Method and Manual*, used as text-books in about sixty seminaries and colleges; Brown's *Aramaic Grammar*; Lyon's *Assyrian Manual*; and last, but not least, Lansing's *Arabic Manual*. With the witness of such facts before us, who can doubt that Semitic studies have a brilliant future before them in America?

And there can be no doubt that the study of Arabic will hold a prominent place. Apart from the fact that it is the language of the Koran and possesses an extensive literature, it is one of the richest languages ever spoken, and, in spite of all that Assyriologists like Friedrich Delitzsch and Sayce may say, it approximates most closely, we believe, to the type of the proto-Semitic and has developed most fully its inherent germs. If this be true, and it hardly admits of a question, then the Hebrew language can best be studied in the light cast upon it mainly, though not indeed exclusively, by the Arabic.

On this account, as well as on account of its inherent excellence, we cordially welcome Dr. Lansing's book. It meets a long-felt need. Heretofore English-speaking students have shrunk from entering upon the study of the Arabic language, because there were no grammars suitable for beginners. Wright's Grammar is incomparable, but too extensive in its treatment to serve as a textbook in the first stages of study. Peterman's *Grammatica Arabica*, besides being written in Latin (as is also Ewald's), is altogether too brief and needs at all points to be supplemented by the oral instruction of a teacher to be intelligible to the beginner. Last year Socin's Arabic Grammar was published both in English and in German; but aside from the meagreness of its treatment, it has other defects that stand in the way of its usefulness. Dr. Lansing has succeeded in observing the happy mean, and we have no doubt his book will be found to serve the purpose for which it was designed.

Arabic, we may say, is the author's native tongue. The son of a missionary in the East, he spent a large part of his life among Arabic-speaking peoples. He knew no English until he was brought to this country at an early age to be instructed. He is a graduate of Union College and of the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, in which he is now and has been for several years the Sage Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis. Speaking modern Arabic as fluently as English, he is an earnest student and an enthusiastic teacher of the language which Arabia's admiring sons call *lisānulmalāykati*, the language of the angels.

From such an author we might justly expect an excellent manual, nor are we disappointed. The definitions are concise, yet clear, and illustrated by examples, which ought, however, to have

followed the definitions immediately, instead of being placed at the end of the sections. The matter of the book is well arranged, the topics following each other in natural order. Throughout there are exercises for the student especially in translating from Arabic into English and from English into Arabic. It would be better, we think, if these exercises were both more numerous and more extensive. However, besides the grammar, the main part of the book, there is also a chrestomathy, which will introduce the student far enough into Arabic to enable him afterward to prosecute the study by himself. This chrestomathy comprises the four first chapters of Genesis, with several Suras from the Koran, and is accompanied with a vocabulary giving all the words in the Arabic selections and with a transliteration, translation and analysis of part of the Arabic text. The typographical work is admirably done and reflects great credit on the American Publication Society of Hebrew. The paper is good, the type clear and the pages not overcrowded. The proof-reading has been so carefully attended to that only a few unimportant errors in printing are found. We thank the author for this first fruit of his labors, and express the hope that it is only the beginning of what he will yet live to accomplish.

A GREEK ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; being Grimm's Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, Translated, Revised and Enlarged. By Joseph Henry Thayer, D.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of Harvard University. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1887. Price, in Cloth, \$5.00.

Every minister of the Gospel should, if possible, study the New Testament Scriptures in the original Greek. Such study will be found far more fruitful in beneficial results than any amount of the mere studying of Commentaries, no matter how good. Besides, a knowledge of the Scriptures in the language in which they were written by their authors is necessary to the using of the best Commentaries with any real advantage. To read profitably, however, the New Testament in the original, a good Lexicon of New Testament Greek is indispensable. It is also very desirable that such Lexicon should contain the latest results of critical investigation in lexicography and in exegesis. Just what is needed in every respect is now placed within the reach of English-speaking students by the publication of the work whose title is given above.

This Lexicon is based on the Second Edition of Professor

Grimm's *Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti*, which appeared in 1878, and which, at the time of its publication, was pronounced by Professor Schürer, who had used the earlier edition for years, to be "not only unquestionably the best among existing New Testament Lexicons, but, apart from all comparisons, a work of the highest intrinsic merit, and one which is admirably adapted to initiate a learner into an acquaintance with the language of the New Testament." The present work, however, is not a mere translation of that of Grimm. Professor Thayer, as stated in the title-page, has revised and enlarged the work, and thus considerably improved it and increased its usefulness. Among other things he has especially endeavored to verify all references, to note more generally the extra-biblical usage of words, to give the derivation of words in cases where it is agreed upon by the best etymologists and is of interest to the general student, to render complete the enumeration of verbal forms actually found in the New Testament, to note more fully the variations in the Greek text of current editions, to introduce brief discussions of New Testament synonyms, and to multiply cross references to grammatical works both sacred and classical. On disputed points great care has been taken to note fairly rival interpretations and to cite impartially authors of diverse denominational connections. As an aid to researches involving the language of the New Testament there are also given, in an appendix, lists of later, *i. e.*, Post-Aristotelian, Greek words, of borrowed words, of Biblical, *i. e.*, New Testament, Greek, of words peculiar to individual New Testament writers, and of forms of verbs.

The primary intention of this Lexicon, Professor Thayer states in the preface, is "to satisfy the needs and to guide the researches of the average student; although the specialist will often find it serviceable, and, on the other hand, the beginner will find that he has not been forgotten." It differs from the Biblico-Theological Lexicon of Professor Cremer in that it is more strictly a Lexicon. It is not as theological as the work of Professor Cremer, but while the latter contains only the Greek words affected by the influence of Christianity, this contains all the words found in the various editions of the New Testament in Greek. Those, therefore, who possess the very valuable work of Professor Cremer will nevertheless find this of great service to them. For constant use in the

studying of the New Testament we are convinced, from an examination of the present work, that it is superior to any other Lexicon of its kind in the English language, and that ministers and thorough students of Scripture generally cannot go amiss in purchasing it.

A HAND-BOOK OF CHRISTIAN SYMBOLS AND STORIES OF THE SAINTS, As Illustrated in Art. By Clara Erskine Clement. Edited by Katherine E. Conway. With Descriptive Illustrations. Boston: Ticknor & Company. 1886. Price, \$2.50.

This is an interesting and attractive book and will prove a valuable acquisition to almost any library. It is composed of two parts. The first part relates to "Symbolism in Art," and treats of General Symbols, of the Symbolism of Color, of Symbols of God the Father, of God the Son, of the Holy Ghost, of the Trinity, of Angels, of the Virgin, of the Evangelists, of the Apostles and of the Monastic Orders, and of Votive Pictures, Anachronisms, etc. The information given on all these various subjects is unusually clear and concise, yet at the same time very satisfactory. The second part, which makes up by far the larger portion of the volume, consists of "Legends and Stories which have been Illustrated in Art." These legends and stories of the Saints, as told by the author, are in themselves very entertaining reading: What, however, makes this collection of them especially desirable is, that a knowledge of them, which is not easily acquired at first hand, is indispensable to those who would fully understand and enjoy the paintings of the Great Masters, copies and prints of which adorn so many homes; and also to the general reader, as reference to them is so frequently made in the literature of all Christian nations. In addition to its other merits, the book is printed on fine paper, beautifully illustrated and attractively bound. We would recommend it to all our readers as a very useful hand-book. Ministers especially will find it very convenient to have within easy reach, and from it may gather many striking illustrations of divine truth.

"MANNERS MAKETH MAN." By the Author of "How to be Happy, though Married." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1887. Price, \$1.25.

This is not a book of etiquette, as some might infer from the title, but a collection of essays relating to the proper conduct of life. The number of different subjects treated is thirty. Among these are,—*"Good Manners," "God Almighty's Gentlemen," "Mind*

Whom You Marry," "Keeping Up Appearances," "Family Government," "Conversation," "Vital Force," "Success in Life," and "The Wisdom of the Foolish." To those who are acquainted with the author's previous book, "How to be Happy, though Married," it is scarcely necessary to say that these essays sparkle with wit and abound in sound sense and in keen criticism. No one can take up the book and begin reading them without becoming deeply interested in them. The instruction which they convey is both pointed and timely. The book is one which should be especially read by young persons. Its wise counsels can scarcely fail to be of benefit to them. To enable our readers to judge of the standpoint of the author, and at the same time to call attention to a truth too much forgotten in the discussion of the labor question, we take the following passage from the essay on "God Almighty's Gentlemen:" "Neither the possession of a vote by the poor nor the fashionable philanthropy of the rich can regenerate society. Nothing but true Christianity can raise the characters of the poor and humble the pride of the rich, so that both ends of society may enjoy Christian liberty, which is just the reverse of Atheistic license. Only Christ Himself can bring about equality and fraternity between different classes. Without His Spirit guiding men, how could there be such a thing as equality? for he would take who had the power, and he would keep who could. Christ is the only foundation of true brotherhood. Nothing can bridge over the chasm which unhappily separates class from class except mutual forbearance and self-sacrifice; in other words, a realization of 'the Carpenter's' spirit."

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. By Rev. Theodore Appel, D.D., Author of "Recollections of College Life." Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board. 1886. Price, in paper covers, 50 cents; in cloth, 75 cents.

This is a very valuable volume and should find a place in the library of every minister of the Reformed Church. The members of the Reformed Church generally will also find it worth purchasing and reading, as much may be learned from it which should be of the highest interest to them. Of the general character of the book our readers can judge from the earlier chapters which appeared in the July and October numbers of this REVIEW for 1886.

As Dr. Appel has had access to the original letters and other documents of those who were most active in founding the Seminary he has been able to give an inside history of its beginnings, which possesses unusual merit and interest. His work cannot fail to be a standard authority on the subject of which it treats. It is prefaced with an Introduction by Rev. Eml. V. Gerhart, D.D., Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Seminary.

MEMORIAL OF COL. BOUQUET: ALSO OF SCHOOLMASTER ENOCH BROWN AND HIS SCHOLARS, MASSACRED BY INDIANS, 1764. By Rev. Cyrus Cort, of Greencastle, Franklin Co., Pa. Lancaster, Pa.: Steinman & Hensel, Printers. 1886. Price, in paper covers, 60 cents; in cloth, 75 cents.

To those who are specially interested in the history of the "Trying Days of Our Pioneer Forefathers" this volume will prove a treasure of considerable value. Its author and editor, Rev. Cyrus Cort, is well-known as a forcible writer and a careful and trustworthy historian, and deserves much credit for his earnest efforts to promote an interest in local history. As indicated by the title, the present volume is made up of several distinct parts which may also be obtained separately. All, however, relate to the same period of Provincial history. The first part consists of an interesting sketch of Col. Henry Bouquet and his campaigns. It is the fullest history of Col. Bouquet that has as yet been published, and has received high commendation from eminent scholars both in this country and in Europe. The second part gives a full and graphic account of the celebration held August 6, 1883, on the Bushy Run battle-field in commemoration of the important victory won at that place by Bouquet over the Confederates of Pontiac, on August 6, 1763. The addresses delivered by Rev. Cyrus Cort, General James A. Beaver and Judge John E. Parke, and the poem read by Dr. Frank Cowan, on that occasion, are all given in full. The third part is a "Memorial of Enoch Brown and Eleven Scholars." It contains a description of the massacre of Brown and his pupils by Indians July 26, 1764; and also a full account of the services held, and the addresses and poem delivered, August 4, 1885, at the unveiling of the monuments erected on the site of the school-house where the massacre occurred and at the grave where its victims are buried. An appendix gives some additional information relating to Brown and the Memorial Services, together with the Centennial Memorial Sermons delivered by Revs. Cort, Hassler and Knappen-

berger, September 7, 1884, when the Centennial of Franklin Co., Pa., was celebrated. The volume as a whole is interesting and instructive.

BEFORE AN AUDIENCE: or, The Use of the Will in Public Speaking. Talks to the Students of the University of St. Andrews and the University of Aberdeen. By Nathan Sheppard, Author of "Shut up in Paris;" Editor of "Darwinism Stated by Darwin Himself;" "The Dickens' Reader;" "Character Readings from George Eliot;" and "George Eliot's Essays." Funk & Wagnalls. New York, 10 & 12 Dey Street; London, 44 Fleet Street. 1886. Price, 75 cents.

It is important that those whose calling requires them to address public audiences should be able to do so in the most effective manner. There are few public speakers, however, whose delivery is wholly free from serious faults of one kind or another. These talks are designed to point out how these faults can be corrected. The author's object in them is not to lay on rules from without, but to awaken the will and the instincts that the speaker finds within. He does not propose to teach him how to entertain by a display of elocutionary recitations, which he looks upon as mere child's play, but to give him some suggestions that may enable him to reach, and move, and influence men by means of sermon, lecture, speech, or plea, which he holds to be man's work. The subjects considered in the talks are, a good speaking voice, articulation, physical earnestness, self-reliance, the art of being natural, the dramatic element in public speaking, the rhetoric for public speaking, audiences, how to think of something to say, and the right shape of an audience room. All the talks are unusually interesting and abound in good sense and valuable suggestions. No one, we think, can read them without being both entertained and instructed. Young men about entering a profession which requires them to appear before an audience, will especially find them worth reading and carefully considering. We know of nothing better on the subject of which they treat.

THE BOOK OF REVELATION: An Exposition; Based on the Principles of Prof. Stuart's Commentary, and designed to familiarize those Principles to the Minds of non-Professional Readers. By Israel P. Warren, D.D. Funk & Wagnalls. New York, 10 and 12 Dey Street; London, 44 Fleet Street. 1886. Price, \$1.00.

No book of the New Testament is so perplexing to the ordinary reader as the Book of Revelation. By even great theologians it

has been considered as unintelligible. Luther calls it "a dumb prophecy," and Robert South says, in one of his sermons, that "the more it was studied, the less was it understood." The difficulty which so many have in getting an insight into its meaning, Dr. Warren thinks, is due to the wrong idea they entertain of its nature and purpose. With right views as regards these, he claims, the work does not only become comparatively clear, but also highly instructive. He considers it "a great picture-gallery hung with scenes inspired by a Divine Artist, but sketched in word-colors by the apostle in Patmos." The key to this gallery he finds in the words: "which must shortly come to pass." He holds that it was written during the reign of Nero, and that its prophecies have reference mainly to the destruction of Jerusalem and the downfall of heathen Rome, both of which were actually near at hand when the apostle wrote. The purpose of the book was to comfort the Christians in the severe persecutions to which they were exposed, by showing them that the persecutors would soon be destroyed, and Christianity be ultimately triumphant over all its foes, and that those who suffered for Christ should in the end be abundantly rewarded. The peculiar form in which these truths are set forth, he claims, is due to the fact that the book had to be written "in such a way that its meaning would be concealed from the persecuting powers." Dr. Warren's exposition is concise, but nevertheless deserving of careful consideration. Though we are not prepared to agree with him on all points, yet in the main we are disposed to accept his view of the book as the correct one. Substantially the same view is presented by Dr. Farrar in his work on "The Messages of the Books."

LETTERS TO BOYS AND GIRLS ABOUT THE HOLY LAND AND THE FIRST CHRISTMAS AT BETHLEHEM. By Rev. Theodore Appel, D.D. Reading, Pa.: Daniel Miller, Printer and Publisher. 1886. Price, 75 cents.

This is a little volume of one hundred and fifty-five pages, designed, as its title indicates, especially for boys and girls in the Sunday-school and in the family. It is not a work of fiction in the ordinary sense of the word, as its description of places and events conforms entirely to their geography and history. The writer, indeed, assumes the character of a traveller in order to render more vivid what he describes, and for the same purpose also he writes as though he and his young companions on the voyage were living

many centuries ago. The book gives evidence of a great deal of careful reading. Although the scenes and events the author describes are familiar in a general way, even to Sunday-school scholars, yet it is no easy matter to conduct a narrative of such extent without some inaccuracies, none of which we have discovered in this volume.

But although this book is designed primarily for boys and girls, it furnishes profitable and entertaining reading also for those of a maturer age. It is a good hand-book for Sunday-school teachers and parents in teaching their scholars or children about the Holy Land, and the interesting history connected with that land. So also, although it is a Christmas book, it may be read and studied at any season of the year, and especially during the Epiphany season, which follows Christmas. We commend it to all who feel an interest in the Holy Land and the Scripture history of the birth of our Lord and Saviour. The publisher, Daniel Miller, has done his part of the work well, and presented the contents in a form that is pleasing to the taste.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE: Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London. Vol. IV. Numbers xxvii.; Deuteronomy. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1886. Price, \$1.50 per volume.

Dr. Parker is a popular and successful London preacher and pastor. Such a man must have power. We felt that as we entered his crowded church during our European tour several years ago. His and Spurgeon's are two churches that tourists from America generally try to attend. We now read his fervent prayers and his intense discourses with the vision of the man and his surroundings before us. The large multitude that fills his large church hang upon his words. He is a close and careful student of the Bible, and his discourses have the advantage of having been prepared for a special practical purpose, and not as a mere exposition of the Bible for the general public. They are not a commentary upon Scripture in the ordinary sense of the word, but, as their title states, discourses on passages of Scripture. For a time we were in the habit of reading over with profit his discourses on Apostolic teaching in the Acts, before going into our Bible class in the college on Sunday morning. Of course he is a Biblical scholar, but for our exegesis of special texts and passages we preferred to depend

on other authorities. He is sometimes willful in his exegesis, as, for instance, when he simply assumes and asserts that St. Peter guided the apostles wrong in the election of Matthias by lot. We think, too, that he is too intent on practical application of Scripture to be always safe in its interpretation. But his method is a great help to the minister in using Scripture before a congregation. He teaches, by example, how to popularize Scripture. This is much needed in our congregations,—to go over the Bible and keep the people interested in listening to discourses on a whole book, or series of books, of the Bible in course. We can commend these discourses for this purpose, while we would recommend a safe commentary to be used along with the discourses.

ESSAYS ON EDUCATIONAL REFORMERS. By Robert Hebert Quick, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, late Second Master in the Surrey County School, and formerly Curate of St. Mary's Whitechapel. Reading-Club Edition. Syracuse, N. Y. C. W. Bardeen, Publisher. 1886. Price, \$1.50.

This is a reprint of a volume which first appeared in 1868, and which is considered by competent judges as one of the best books in the English language on the subject of which it treats. It is made up of sketches of the life and work of the most eminent educational reformers since the revival of learning in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries of our era. These sketches are all of a critical character, and give a large amount of valuable and instructive information in a concise form. Among those whose views and methods of instruction are represented and discussed are the Jesuits, Ascham, Milton, Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Jacotot and Spencer. Teachers and other persons interested in education, who desire to acquaint themselves with the educational ideas and systems of these reformers, will find this book admirably suited to their purpose. It will furnish them with just such information as is most desirable and as every intelligent person should possess. In the present edition, moreover, the publisher has increased the value of the book for readers generally, by inserting in brackets translations of the Latin, French and German quotations, appending some biographical notes to the essays, and adding an entirely new and much fuller index, in the preparation of which especial pains was taken to facilitate ready comparison of different views on the same subject, and to indicate the passages where reference is made to the influence of one reformer upon others who followed him.

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF ETHICS, for English Readers. By Henry Sedgwick, Knightsbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge and Author of "The Methods of Ethics." London: Macmillan & Co., and New York. 1886. Price, \$1.00.

The substance of this work appeared some years ago, as an article on "Ethics," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. In its present form this article, however, has been considerably altered and enlarged to meet the needs of English students desirous of obtaining a general knowledge of the history of ethical thought. First we have given, in the form of an introduction, a general view of the different periods treated in the body of the book. The object of this is to assist the reader in grasping and arranging the somewhat compressed historical matter presented to him. What follows is divided into four distinct chapters. The first of these gives a general account of the subject; the second treats of Greek and Græco-Roman Ethics; the third of Christianity and Mediæval Ethics; and the fourth of Modern, chiefly English, Ethics. The aim of the author throughout has been to treat the subject with the greatest possible impartiality and objectivity. The book is a most excellent one in every respect, and especially well suited for a student's manual. All who are interested in ethical questions will find it of great service to them.

MEDITATIONS OF A PARISH PRIEST. Thoughts by Joseph Roux. Introduction by Paul Marieton. Translated from the third French edition by Isabel F. Haggood. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., No. 13 Astor Place. 1886. Price, \$1.25.

The author of this little book is a middle-aged parish priest, in the South of France, who was unknown to the literary world until the publication of these Thoughts made him suddenly famous. The thoughts themselves are unquestionably brilliant and unusually suggestive, and we are, therefore, not surprised at the kind reception which has been accorded them. Those who have not as yet read them have certainly a treat in store for them. The subjects to which they relate are various, and prove the Abbe Roux to be a scholar as well as a profound thinker. Literature, and poets; eloquence, and orators; history, and historians; mind, talent, and character; joy, suffering, and fortune; time, life, death, and the future; the family, childhood, and old age; the country, and the peasant; love, friendship, and friends; God, and religion, have all

claimed his thoughts, and upon all these has he meditated, until, to some extent, at least, they have yielded their secrets to him.

THE MYSTERY OF PAIN. By James Hinton, M.D., Author of "Life in Nature," "Man and His Dwelling Place," "Health and Its Conditions," etc. With an Introduction by James R. Nichols, M.D., Author of "When? What? Where?" etc. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co., the Old Corner Book-store 1886. Price, \$1.00.

This is a small volume of only one hundred and twenty-one pages, exclusive of the brief Introduction by Dr. Nichols, which fills seven additional pages. It is a reprint of a book which appeared in England twenty years ago. When first published it had only a limited sale, but since the death of the author it has been widely circulated and read, and has become somewhat of a classic on the subject of which it treats. Although Dr. Hinton was a practical physician, the work is not of a physiological, but of a psychological and religious character. It is addressed more especially to the sorrowful, and is designed to cast a bright gleam of light athwart the darkness and to bring joy out of the very bosom of distress, by showing that pain is related to pleasure and is necessary to the constitution of the social and moral world. Though the views presented may not prove satisfactory in all respects, yet the book is one well calculated to cheer the desponding and miserable, and we would heartily commend it to the afflicted, and also to the general reader. A deep religious tone pervades it throughout.